

EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
1759 Lewis Road
Presidio of Monterey, Monterey, CA 93944

This report represents the findings of the External Evaluation Team that visited
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center on March 5-8, 2018

Jill Stearns, Ph.D.
Chair

List of Team Members

Chair

Dr. Jill Stearns
President
Modesto Junior College

Assistant

Dr. Jennifer Hamilton-Zellet
Vice President of Instruction
Modesto Junior College

ACADEMIC REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Kevin Ballinger
Vice President of Instruction
Orange Coast College

Dr. Meghan Chen
Dean, Library & Learning Resources
Mt. San Antonio College

Ms. Sarah Shepard
Faculty
West Hills College Coalinga

Mr. Jeff Stearns
Division Chair, Language Arts and ALO
Honolulu Community College

ADMINISTRATIVE REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Michael Zimmerman
President
MTI College

Dr. Angelica Suarez
Vice President for Student Affairs
Southwestern College

Dr. Chialin Hsieh
Senior Dean of Planning, and Institutional
Effectiveness
Los Medanos College

Ms. MaryBeth Benvenuti
Director of Business & Administrative
Services
College of Alameda

Summary of the External Evaluation Report

INSTITUTION: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center

DATES OF VISIT: March 5-8, 2018

TEAM CHAIR: Jill Stearns, Ph. D.

A ten member accreditation team visited Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) on March 5-8, 2018 for the purpose of determining whether the Institute meets Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team evaluated how well the Institute is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement, and submitting recommendations to the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) regarding the Institute's accredited status.

In preparation for the visit, the team chair received training on December 7, 2017. The entire external evaluation team received team training provided by staff from ACCJC on February 7, 2018. The team chair and team assistant conducted a pre-visit to DLIFLC on January 17, 2018. During this visit, the chair met with leadership and key personnel involved in the self-evaluation preparation process.

The evaluation team received the DLIFLC self-evaluation document and related evidence several weeks prior to the site visit. Team members found the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report (ISER) to be comprehensive. The ISER describes the planning process, programs, and services that support the institute mission as well as addresses the ACCJC's Eligibility Requirements, Commission Standards, and Commission Policies. The team confirmed that the ISER was developed and written with broad participation by the entire institute community including faculty, staff, students, and leaders, as well as their colleagues from the Garrison Command. The team found that the Institute provided a very analytical and comprehensive self-evaluation containing many self-identified action plans for institutional improvement. The Quality Focus Essay (QFE) and Action Improvement Plans (AIP) exemplify the Institute's desire and motivation to improve institutional effectiveness, especially with regard to achieving a holistic approach to serving service member students.

On Monday March 5, 2018, the team and ACCJC liaison, Dr. Richard Winn, gathered at the hotel for a lunch meeting to launch the visit. In the afternoon, the team was introduced to the DLIFLC community at a reception held for the team. During the evaluation visit, team members conducted approximately 70 formal meetings and interviews involving employees, students, and board of visitors members. There were also less formal interactions with students and employees outside of officially scheduled interviews as well as informal observations of classes and other learning venues.

Furthermore, three members of the team traveled to the Seaside location where they observed an advanced interpretation class. Two open forums provided the DLIFLC community opportunities to meet with members of the evaluation team. The team appreciated the deep sense of pride,

passion, and respect for the Institute and its students demonstrated by all who participated in the forums.

The team reviewed numerous electronic materials supporting the self-evaluation report as well as additional hard copy and electronic documents requested for review prior to and during the visit. Evidence reviewed by the team included, but was not limited to, documents such as institutional plans, program review procedures and reports, student learning outcomes evidence, student achievement data, distance education learning resources, enrollment information, committee minutes and materials, and shared governance structure. The team also viewed evidence and documentation through the DLIFLC website and electronic copies stored on flash drives provided by the Institute.

The team greatly appreciated the enthusiasm, support, and hospitality from DLIFLC employees and students throughout the visit, especially from the college commandant, provost, accreditation liaison officers, and protocol staff. The team appreciated key staff members who assisted the team with requests for individual meetings and other needs throughout the evaluation process. Every team request was met in a timely manner including accommodations for meetings and interviews.

The team found the Institute to be in compliance with ACCJC Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations. The team found a number of innovative, student-centered, and effective programs and practices and thus issued a number of commendations to the Institute. The team found that the Institute satisfies the Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and USDE regulations, and issued some recommendations to increase effectiveness in meeting some of the Standards, ERs, policies, and regulations.

Eligibility Requirements

1. Authority

The team confirmed that Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center is authorized to operate as a postsecondary, degree-granting institution by the Department of Defense. The Institute has maintained continuous accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The ACCJC is a regional accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and granted authority through the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008.

The Institute meets the ER.

2. Operational Status

The team confirmed the Institute is operational and provided educational services to 2,352 students in fiscal year 2016. The variety of programs offered lead to the awards of Linguist Certificate, DLIFLC Diploma Certificate and may lead to an Associate of Arts degree.

The Institute meets the ER.

3. Degrees

The team confirmed that all courses of language study at the Institute, though they vary in length of offering, lead to certification and/or degrees. Training is offered in 17 languages and/or dialects, and include these levels: Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, Special Projects, and Refresher. Courses of study range from 6- to 64-weeks in duration. In the fiscal year 2016, the Institute awarded over 1,100 Associate of arts Degrees to eligible students.

The Institute meets the ER.

4. Chief Executive Officer

The evaluation team confirmed that the current Commandant, COL Phillip Deppert, was appointed in accordance with Department of Defense Directive 5160.41e, which grants the Secretary of the Army the authority to nominate the Commandant. As of July 29, 2015, COL Phillip Deppert assumed command of DLIFLC.

The Institute meets the ER.

5. Financial Accountability

The team confirmed that DLIFLC is required to be audit-ready on a daily basis in compliance with the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). The Institute is not audited as an independent organization rather as part of the Army as a whole through the Annual Budgetary Activity Report. DLIFLC is not a Title IV institution.

The Institute meets the ER.

**Checklist for Evaluating Compliance with
Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies**

Public Notification of an Evaluation Team Visit and Third Party Comment

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of a comprehensive evaluation visit.
- The institution cooperates with the evaluation team in any necessary follow-up related to the third party comment.
- The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions* as to third party comment.
[Regulation citation: 602.23(b).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The Institute demonstrates compliance with the Commission Policy on Rights and Responsibilities of the Commission and Member Institutions as to third party comment. The Institute provided information about how the public may provide third party comments to the College (ISER p. 54-55). DLIFLC solicited third party comment through reports to the Board of Visitors during which public comment is invited, an announcement by the Commandant, and posted on the Institute's web page. The Institute cooperated in addressing any questions or comments from the evaluation team related to this policy.

Standards and Performance with Respect to Student Achievement

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance across the institution, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. Course completion is included as one of these elements of student achievement. Other elements of student achievement performance for measurement have been determined as appropriate to the institution's mission.
- The institution has defined elements of student achievement performance within each instructional program, and has identified the expected measure of performance within each defined element. The defined elements include, but are not limited to, job placement rates for program completers, and for programs in fields where licensure is required, the licensure examination passage rates for program completers.

- X The institution-set standards for programs and across the institution are relevant to guide self-evaluation and institutional improvement; the defined elements and expected performance levels are appropriate within higher education; the results are reported regularly across the campus; and the definition of elements and results are used in program-level and institution-wide planning to evaluate how well the institution fulfills its mission, to determine needed changes, to allocating resources, and to make improvements.
- X The institution analyzes its performance as to the institution-set standards and as to student achievement, and takes appropriate measures in areas where its performance is not at the expected level.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(i); 602.17(f); 602.19 (a-e).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- X The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The Institute articulated its institution-standards for student achievement and documented its performance relative to these standards. The Annual Program Review and the Quarterly Review and analysis process use the institution-set standards for the purpose of ongoing program review. The Institute has developed a strategic plan to develop a Culturally Based Professional Military Linguist (2+2+2) to support improvement in learning and has implemented a rigorous tracking system to ensure appropriate measures where performance is not at the expected level.

Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Evaluation Items:

- X Credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education (in policy and procedure).
- X The assignment of credit hours and degree program lengths is verified by the institution and is reliable and accurate across classroom based courses, laboratory classes, distance education classes, and for courses that involve clinical practice (if applicable to the institution).
- NA Tuition is consistent across degree programs (or there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).
- NA Any clock hour conversions to credit hours adhere to the Department of Education’s conversion formula, both in policy and procedure, and in practice.
- X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Degrees and Credits*.
[Regulation citations: 600.2 (definition of credit hour); 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.24(e), (f); 668.2; 668.9.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- X The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution

- to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

Defense Language Institute uses the Carnegie Unit system for defining credits. These policies conform to commonly accepted practice regarding course content and time invested. Units of credit awarded are consistent across all languages regardless of length of program due to institution-set standards for student proficiency upon completion. DLIFLC is consistent in awarding academic credit and conforms to commonly accepted practice, including time invested and content mastery.

The Institute does not convert clock hours to credit hours.

Transfer Policies

Evaluation Items:

- Transfer policies are appropriately disclosed to students and to the public.
- Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to accept credits for transfer.
- The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Transfer of Credit*.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(viii); 602.17(a)(3); 602.24(e); 668.43(a)(ii).]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does Not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The institution complies with the Commission Policy on Transfer of Credit. Policies are included in the General Catalog (p. 67) and describe requirements for acceptance of transfer credit. The Institute ensures completion of quality work by requiring transfer units to be from an institution listed with the Department of Education and that meet the General Education course requirements. The General Catalog includes criteria with regard to credit by examination including Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), DANTES Subject Standardized Test (DSST), and military service credit.

Distance Education and Correspondence Education

Evaluation Items:

- The institution has policies and procedures for defining and classifying a course as offered by distance education or correspondence education, in alignment with USDE definitions.

- ___ There is an accurate and consistent application of the policies and procedures for determining if a course is offered by distance education (with regular and substantive interaction with the instructor, initiated by the instructor, and online activities are included as part of a student’s grade) or correspondence education (online activities are primarily “paperwork related,” including reading posted materials, posting homework and completing examinations, and interaction with the instructor is initiated by the student as needed).
- ___ The institution has appropriate means and consistently applies those means for verifying the identity of a student who participates in a distance education or correspondence education course or program, and for ensuring that student information is protected.
- ___ The technology infrastructure is sufficient to maintain and sustain the distance education and correspondence education offerings.
The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education*.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(iv), (vi); 602.17(g); 668.38.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- ___ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- ___ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- ___ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission’s requirements.

Narrative:

The Institute does not offer credit-bearing distance or correspondence education.

Student Complaints

Evaluation Items:

- X The institution has clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, and the current policies and procedures are accessible to students in the college catalog and online.
- X The student complaint files for the previous six years (since the last comprehensive evaluation) are available; the files demonstrate accurate implementation of the complaint policies and procedures.
The team analysis of the student complaint files identifies any issues that may be indicative of the institution’s noncompliance with any Accreditation Standards.
- X The institution posts on its website the names of associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs, and provides contact information for filing complaints with such entities.
- X The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* and the *Policy on Student and Public Complaints Against Institutions*.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(ix); 668.43.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

The Institute has an internal process for handling student complaints across all aspects of the student experience. The team was not allowed to view student complaint files due to military protocol and regulation which supersedes the requirement to review contents of the student complaint file. The team determined through review of evidence including the website and General Catalog that the complaint process is clear and accessible to students.

Policy on Governing Boards for Military Institutions

The Accreditation Standards and Eligibility Requirements require that colleges have a functioning governing board responsible for the quality, integrity, and financial stability of the institution and ensure that the mission is carried-out.

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

DLIFLC has a Board of Visitors with broad responsibility to recommend policy, identify the educational, personal, and financial requirements of the institution

Institutional Disclosure and Advertising and Recruitment Materials

Evaluation Items:

- The institution provides accurate, timely (current), and appropriately detailed information to students and the public about its programs, locations, and policies.
- The institution complies with the Commission *Policy on Institutional Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*.
- The institution provides required information concerning its accredited status as described above in the section on Student Complaints.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(vii); 668.6.]

Conclusion Check-Off (mark one):

- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution

to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.

- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

DLIFLC provides students and the public clear and accurate information about its programs, locations, and policies. Accurate information regarding the accreditation status of the Institute is available in the General Catalog and on the website.

Title IV Compliance

Evaluation Items:

- _____ The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program, including findings from any audits and program or other review activities by the USDE.
- _____ The institution has addressed any issues raised by the USDE as to financial responsibility requirements, program record-keeping, etc. If issues were not timely addressed, the institution demonstrates it has the fiscal and administrative capacity to timely address issues in the future and to retain compliance with Title IV program requirements.
- _____ The institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by the USDE. Remedial efforts have been undertaken when default rates near or meet a level outside the acceptable range.
- _____ The institution demonstrates compliance with the Commission *Policy on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations* and the *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV*.
[Regulation citations: 602.16(a)(1)(v); 602.16(a)(1)(x); 602.19(b); 668.5; 668.15; 668.16; 668.71 et seq.]

Conclusion Check-Off:

- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but that follow-up is recommended.
- _____ Contractual relationships of the institution to offer or receive educational, library, and support services meet the Accreditation Standards and have been approved by the Commission through substantive change if required.
- _____ The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the institution does not meet the Commission's requirements.

Narrative:

DLIFLC is not a Title IV institution.

DLIFLC Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations and Recommendations

Recommendation 1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute review the process to identify, prioritize, and allocate resources to support institutional needs inclusive of curriculum development and revision. (I.B.6, II.A.2, II.A.16, II.B.1)

Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute strengthen its integration of program review, evaluation, planning and resource allocation processes to ensure all areas are supporting the Institute's mission. (I.B.7, I.B.9, II.B.1, II.B.3)

Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute ensure data collected in the evaluation process, including program review, the Interim Student Questionnaire (ISQ), and the End-of-Course Student Questionnaire (ESQ), is used in a consistent manner to inform decision-making. Further, as part of the regular evaluation process to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute ensure that results of evaluation are widely communicated. (II.A.2, II.B.1, II.B.2)

Recommendation 4 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends the Institute regularly assess library resources and services for their effectiveness and contribution to student learning outcomes including resources and services provided by third-party vendors and agreements. The results of the assessments will inform the unit's regular program reviews leading to improvement and connecting to resource allocation. (II.B.3, II.B.4)

Commendation 1: The team commends the Institute for their extremely clear mission that drives planning and for being well-resourced to accomplish the mission. (I.A.1, I.A.4, II.A.1, IV.B.3)

Commendation 2: The team commends the Institute for student learning and achievement as demonstrated by the quality of linguists developed through short, focused programs and assessed via program learning outcomes. (II.A.1, II.A.3, II.A.5, II.A.6, II.A.13)

Commendation 3: The team commends the Institute for their sensing sessions, formative class assessment, as an exemplary practice of gleaned student feedback. (II.C.1, II.C.2)

Commendation 4: The team commends the Institute for providing holistic student support services enacted authentically, to include the role of the Military Language Instructors (MLIs) as essential support for students and the adoption of a mascot that serves as a therapy animal to support wellness of students, faculty, and staff. (II.C.1)

Commendation 5: The team commends the Institute for the professional development opportunities provided to faculty and staff in the leadership development program. (III.A.14, IV.A.1, IV.B.1)

Commendation 6: The team commends the Institute for leadership that has led to and embraced shared governance structures and practices. (IV.A, IV.B)

Commendation 7: The team commends the Institute on the Board of Visitors that provides relevant support to promote constructive changes and plans underway at Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center. (IV.A.5, IV.C.1, IV.C.4, IV.C.7, IV.C.8, IV.C.10)

STANDARD I.A – Mission

General Observations

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) has a mission statement that broadly defines the institution's educational purpose, intended student population, types of credentials offered, and its commitment to student learning and achievement. DLIFLC uses both quantitative and qualitative evaluations to measure how well they meet the Institute's mission. The Institute's academic programs and services are aligned with the mission and this alignment is documented through systematic evaluation processes which guide decision making, planning, and resource allocation. This mission is widely disseminated.

Findings and Evidence

The mission statement describes the Institute's broad educational purpose by focusing on the unique role of its student population, whose education in foreign languages and culture prepares them to defend the United States, its allies, and U.S. national interests. In specifying national security as the end goal for the Institute's activities, the mission statement makes reference to the broad base of the Institute's stakeholders, including the branches of the Armed Forces; Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and other government agencies. The needs and requirements of these entities, in turn, shape the programs and projects of DLIFLC as well as the educational experience of its military students. The Institute's commitment to achieving student learning and student achievement is expressed through the national security imperative of the DLIFLC mission. This is further underscored in the Institute's vision: "to deliver the world's best culturally-based foreign language education and training – at the point of need." (1.A.1, ER 6)

DLIFLC uses both quantitative and qualitative data to determine how effectively it is meeting its mission. The Institute uses this data to identify institutional planning priorities and to ensure the Institute is meeting the educational needs of its student body. Departments set and assess departmental goals and align them directly with the strategic goals of the Institute. (I.A.2)

The Institute's Annual Campaign Plan serves as the strategic plan and outlines the alignment of programs and services to the Institute's mission and institutional goals. The Annual Campaign Plan sets forth cycles for planning and review. Student learning outcomes align to program goals and degree objectives and institutional goals align to program learning outcomes. Within their review, departments include requests for resources necessary to meet their department goals and ultimately the goals of the Institute and the mission. Following completion of the reviews, the Commandant synthesizes the information and develops the Annual Campaign Plan. The Annual Campaign Plan includes institutional priorities for the coming year, the resources required to support those priorities, and status updates on the strategic plan goals. (1.A.3)

Publication of the mission statement is coordinated by the Deputy Chief of Staff of Operations, Mission Public Affairs, and the Division of Academic Administration. The mission statement is placed on the official DLIFLC website and included in the General Catalog. In addition, posters with the mission and vision statements are posted throughout the Institute. The mission and vision statements are printed inside graduation handouts shared with visitors and students'

families. The mission statement was last assessed and updated in 2017. The Board of Visitors reviewed the mission statement during the December 2017 board meeting. (I.A.4)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard I.A and ER 6.

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD I.B – Assuring Academic Quality and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations

DLIFLC representatives participate in rigorous, ongoing dialogue about student outcomes, equity, effectiveness, and achievement. The Institute has defined student learning outcomes for all academic programs in the respective program's master syllabi. DLIFLC has established language proficiency for student achievement that directly supports its unique mission. Data is used to support improvement of student learning and achievement. The Institute uses a program review process to evaluate its goals and objectives around student learning and student achievement. Disaggregated data is used to assure the efficacy of strategies and resource allocation. The Institute is engaged in regular evaluation of several policies and practices designed to support the institution. The Institute's assessment and evaluation activities are shared across the institution.

Findings and Evidence

The Institute participates in robust, ongoing dialogue about student outcomes, equity, effectiveness, and achievement. Dialogue takes place across the Institute in Annual Program Reviews, Quarterly Reviews and Analyses, and a variety of leadership councils. Student outcomes and standards, which are developed in conjunction with the Department of Defense, are widely discussed. An example of the Institute's commitment to continuous improvement is the implementation of the Leadership and Operations Review, a revised evaluation procedure for academic and military processes alike. Additionally, the implementation of Tiger Team 2022, a group of subcommittees dedicated to analyzing the efficacy of the institution's organizational structure stands in evidence of the Institute's commitment to continuous quality improvement. The Institute has launched a SharePoint site to support communication via ongoing dialogue efforts. (I.B.1)

The Institute has defined student learning outcomes for all academic programs in the respective program's master syllabi. Proficiency requirements are identified by Department of Defense directives and regulations. Assessments are administered and monitored on a weekly basis. The Institute's support services have defined SLOs that are assessed during the program review process. Examination of the evidence revealed that numerous program improvements have occurred as a result of this assessment. (I.B.2, ER 11)

DLIFLC has established language proficiency for student achievement that directly support its unique mission. These standards are identified in Department of Defense directives and widely communicated across the Institute. Annual Program Reviews, presentations to the Board of Visitors, and publication at the Aiso Library ensure that the information is accessible and available to all constituents. (I.B.3, ER 11)

The Institute uses data to support student learning and achievement. Evidential reviews and interviews confirmed that data analysis is robust, purposeful, and comprehensive. Several examples of ongoing assessment and improvement were reviewed, including the Annual

Campaign Plan, the implementation of Tiger Team 2022, and Annual Program Summaries. (I.B.4)

The Institute uses a program review process to evaluate its goals and objectives around student learning and student achievement. Quarterly Review and Analysis provides regular and ongoing assessment of achieving identified goals. Data is disaggregated by student characteristics that support DLIFLC institutional goals including gender and military service branch. The evidence reviewed demonstrates the robust use of data such as DLPT and OPI scores in assessing the Institute's student achievement that resulted in programmatic improvements. (I.B.5)

DFIFLC uses disaggregated data to assure the efficacy of strategies to improve student learning and achievement. Student subpopulations are unique to the institution and support their unique mission. The program review process provides data analysis that is used by leadership to allocate the institution's resources. The evidence demonstrated a recent reallocation of staff to support curriculum development; however, there is no clear mechanism for determining priority of curriculum for revision. The Institute has modified program length in two basic courses programs as a direct result of data analysis. (I.B.6)

The Institute is engaged in regular evaluation of several policies and practices designed to support the institution. Policies are derived from both internal and external parties. Program reviews for academic and student support services are completed at least every two years, beginning in 2016. At the time of the visit, the revised process had not been evaluated; the Institute plans to review its efforts around program review. The evidence confirms the ongoing evaluation of institution leadership using the Leadership and Operations Review model, shared governance analysis through creation of the Shared Governance Guide, and triannual review of institutional policies. (I.B.7)

The Institute's assessment and evaluation activities are widely shared across the institution. A variety of venues are used to ensure stakeholders are informed and aware of the institution's activities. Methods include Annual Program Review and Quarterly Review and Analyses, newsletters, and town hall meetings. Defense agencies are regularly informed of the Institute's activities through formal presentations and updates. (I.B.8)

DLIFLC engages in continuous, broad based systemic evaluation and planning using a variety of review systems. The Institute uses academic program review, Quarterly Review Analysis, and the Campaign Plan to plan and document progress toward the institution's student outcomes initiative 2+/2+/2. This process is complemented by team meetings and diversely composed teams, including a learning technology specialist and a military language instructor who support the teaching team, which address topics, tasks, issues, and needs. The team suggests that the Institute explore means to evince these less formal mechanisms for conducting assessment and informing support areas' strategic plans so that the Institute's comprehensive evaluation and planning process can be further solidified. (I.B.9, ER 19)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard I.B, ER11, and ER 19.

Institute Recommendations

Recommendation 1 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute review the process to identify, prioritize, and allocate resources to support institutional needs inclusive of curriculum development and revision. (I.B.6, II.A.2, II.A.16, II.B.1)

Recommendation 2 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute strengthen its integration of program review, evaluation, planning and resource allocation processes to ensure all areas are supporting the Institute's mission. (I.B.7, I.B.9, II.B.1, II.B.3)

STANDARD I.C – Institutional Integrity

General Observations

DLIFLC provides all required information to students and the public. This includes providing up-to-date catalogs, board policies on academic freedom, and institutional data on student achievement and learning. The Institute regularly reviews and updates this information. DLIFLC ensures that faculty distinguish between personal convictions and professionally accepted views in their discipline, and ensures integrity and honesty among its students, personnel, and in its relationships with all external agencies. The institution ensures its commitment to high quality education that is paramount to all other objectives.

Findings and Evidence

DLIFLC provides accurate information to all relevant members of its community including students and personnel. The Institute shares this information through various means including its website and catalogue. DLIFLC posts its accreditation status and all relevant reports and communications on an accreditation webpage. Staff noted that while this information on the website is updated regularly, the Mission Public Affairs Office is in the process of creating a standardized operating procedure to document internal processes to maintain their public-facing website to be completed by the end of the year 2018. Additionally, the Institute is migrating to a new SharePoint version, which will allow for a thorough review of internal sites to ensure accuracy and relevancy. (I.C.1)

DLIFLC provides an online and print catalog for students and prospective students with precise, accurate, and current information on all facts, requirements, policies, and procedures. (I.C.2)

DLIFLC regularly generates reports on student achievement to communicate matters of academic quality to appropriate constituencies internal and external to the institution, including prospective students and the public. This information is shared through briefings with the Defense Language Steering Committee and its Board of Visitors. (I.C.3)

Within its catalog, DLIFLC describes its certificates and degrees in terms of their purpose, content, course requirements, and expected learning outcomes. (I.C.4)

DLIFLC regularly reviews institutional policies, procedures, and publications to assure integrity in all representations of its mission, programs, and services. The cycle of review of policies and procedures, or orders, is aligned with the appointment of the Commandant, and those policies requiring updates in the interim are drafted by the specific departments for review and approval of the Commandant. (I.C.5)

Students attending DLIFLC do not pay tuition or fees, as they are salaried military service members. Information about tuition assistance and other forms of support for students is provided through the Education Center in person and through new student orientations. This information is also accurately reflected in the General Catalog. (I.C.6)

DLIFLC uses and publishes the statement on academic freedom on the website. The website includes a reference to the policy on academic freedom by referring the reader to the catalog. The statement on academic freedom outlines the parameters of academic freedom given federal and military regulations. (I.C.7, ER13)

DLIFLC establishes and publishes clear policies and procedures that promote honesty, responsibility and academic integrity. This expected practice is reaffirmed by students signing an acknowledgement as part of the onboarding process. This information is outlined for employees in the Federal Employees Code of Ethics. (I.C.8)

DLIFLC balances its responsibility to ensure that faculty distinguish between personal convictions and professionally accepted views in a discipline. They present data and information fairly and objectively. (I.C.9)

DLIFLC requires conformity to certain codes of conduct stated in policies and procedures that are published in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, Code of Ethics for Federal Employees, employee handbooks, collective bargaining agreements, and other relevant regulations including Regulation 690-1. (I.C.10)

DLIFLC does not offer credit-bearing courses in any foreign locations. (I.C.11)

DLIFLC complies with ACCJC requirements. The Institute has demonstrated this compliance by ensuring it submits to the Commission all required reports in a timely manner, including institutional self-evaluation reports, substantive change reports, follow-up reports, and annual reports. (I.C.12, ER21)

DLIFLC advocates and demonstrates honesty and integrity in its relationship with ACCJC as its only accrediting agency. The Institute describes itself in consistent terms and communicates any changes in its accredited status to the Commission, students, and the public. (I.C.13, ER21)

DLIFLC ensures that its commitments to high quality education, student achievement and student learning are paramount and its mission and goals are the foundation for financial planning, and that sufficient resources are available to support student learning and to sustain new initiatives. This commitment is clearly depicted in the graphic of the Parthenon that outlines the “ends, ways, and means” of achieving the Institute’s mission. (I.C.14)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard I.C, ER13, 19, 20, and 21.

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD II.A – Instructional Programs

General Observations

DLIFLC offers instructional programs, learning and library support services, and student support services aligned with its mission. The Institute's foreign language instruction is taught with quality and rigor appropriate for higher education. DLIFLC assesses instruction periodically during the courses and at course-end, uses student learning outcomes, and evaluates the proficiency of its language programs. Student achievement objectives are clearly stated in the catalog. General education is incorporated in its degree program and spans a broad knowledge to promote intellectual inquiry. The Institute operates a non-credit-bearing continuing education and residence program on an off-site location in Seaside that focuses on more advanced language training.

Findings and Evidence

DLIFLC offers foreign language instruction that follows its mission to provide high quality foreign language education and has clear learning outcomes for its programs leading to degrees, certificates, and awards. The languages taught at the Institute are based on the needs determined by the Department of Defense. Distance education instruction is not credit-bearing and is used to enhance the skills of graduates and others in the field. The Institute defines standards for student achievement and assesses its performance against those standards with proficiency exams. The Institute's degree programs coincide with its mission and are of sufficient content and length, conducted at levels of quality and rigor, and culminate in identified student outcomes. (II.A.1, ER 9, ER 11).

DLIFLC faculty are responsible for ensuring content and methods of instruction meet generally accepted academic and professional standards and expectations. Student learning outcomes are included in syllabi. Faculty evaluate students throughout the course with unit tests, which focus on reading, listening, and speaking. Capstone tests, the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT), and the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) serve as the final assessment of student proficiency and achievement. These assessments provide a numerical score on a five-point scale for Listening (L), Reading (R), and Speaking (S). Current graduation proficiency requirements call for a score of L2/R2/S1. (II.A.2)

Quality Focus Essay

DLIFLC has a directive to increase the minimum graduation proficiency requirements to L2+/R2+/S2 from the previously mandated L2/R2/S1, in response to requests from U.S. government agencies. The increased proficiency level requires DLIFLC to re-evaluate its Basic Course programs and implement improvements for students enrolling in 2022. (ISER, p. 282)

Implementation will follow a clear directive, OPLAN 16-02, which calls for a 76 percent L2+/R2+/S2 student performance rate on the DLPT by fiscal year (FY) 2024 for students graduating from the language programs. (ISER, p. 283)

The Institute recognizes the initiative requires sustained and coordinated efforts across functional organizations and is not limited to changes to teaching and learning. To facilitate this effort, the Commandant issued guidance charging academic support organizations, student service organizations, faculty development organizations, and DLIFLC language programs, to self-evaluate and refine their efforts to improve student outcomes. The guidance extends to staff offices and student support organizations.

The action plan encompasses collaboration among academic support groups and military service detachments, as well as training and professional development programs for faculty to improve student outcomes by integrating innovative instructional methodologies, increasing classroom engagement, and fostering student motivation. It also includes improving the curriculum at the interaction point between teacher and student. (ISER, pp. 285, 288, 290)

The team found that the QFE has a long-term goal, measurable outcomes, and the incorporation of multiple instructional and support units to increase student achievement. The team suggests the Institute consider incorporating the role of the library in implementation of the initiative.

Findings and Evidence continued

DLIFLC has identified student learning outcomes for courses, certificates, and degrees using established institutional procedures. Program reviews evaluate course alignment and learning outcomes assessment from course to program. The program assessment is aligned with the scale defined by the federal Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR), to its vision for a “Culturally Based Professional Military Linguist,” and to the mission of the Institute. The vision for the military linguist aims for undergraduate students to achieve high-level scores of 2+ for listening, 2+ for reading, and 2 for speaking. Course syllabi are provided during orientation week to students in their online course packets and are posted in the classrooms. (II.A.3)

DLIFLC does not offer pre-collegiate coursework but requires new students to take a five-day non-credit orientation program called Introduction to Language Studies (ILS) prior to language teaching. (II.A.4)

The Associate of Arts degree requires 63 semester credits, of which 45 credits are from DLIFLC instruction including nine credits of core curriculum. Completion of a degree requires that 18 credits of general education courses be transferred in or attained through test options. The instruction follows common practices of higher education, including length, depth, rigor, course sequencing, and time to completion. Breadth comes through its general education requirement for its degree program. (II.A.5, ER 12)

The period of time in which students complete their language education varies by language ranging from 36 to 64 weeks in the Basic language programs and 19 weeks in the Intermediate and Advanced programs. Students attend class five days a week for six hours each day, for a total of 30 contact hours weekly, not including Special Assistance hours, if needed, and homework. Students who pursue the Associate of Arts (AA) Degree program must complete outside general education credits. (II.A.6, ER 9)

DLIFLC utilizes a variety of methods including face-to-face teaching and technology-mediated instruction. The main teaching mode is face-to-face with technology resources added as a supplement. The technology-based instruction may be real-time video tele training (VTT), Broadband Language Training System (BLTS), and self-study materials through the web and CD/DVD. Students typically spend six hours in the classroom each day. The Institute does not offer online credit courses. (II.A.7)

All language programs at DLIFLC use unit tests to assess students' performance and progress during the course. To graduate from the program, students are required to take the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) and the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). Unit tests are administered and graded by teaching teams. To minimize inconsistency in test administration and grading, each program conducts training and norming for the teachers and provides written protocols and rubrics on test security, administration, and grading. (II.A.8)

DLIFLC has program outcomes, noted as Final Learning Objectives, which are included in the syllabi for the programs. Student learning outcomes are also included for the course. In its catalog, the Institute defines the proficiency expected for each skill level in listening, reading, and speaking. The proficiency definitions are specifically explained in the catalog. Each unit of credit corresponds to one semester hour with a minimum of 16 contact hours of instruction. The Institute provides appropriate information about the awarding of academic credit in its catalog. (II.A.9, ER 10)

DLIFLC does not offer General Education courses beyond the core courses, so it does not have comparable learning outcomes for articulation. The general education degree requirements are modeled after California community college degree requirements. DLIFLC also accepts transfer credit for CLEP and DANTES tests, which are forms of credit by examination. The Division of Academic Administration has articulation agreements with three colleges and is currently pursuing additional articulation agreements. (II.A.10, ER10)

The Associate of Arts degree program includes the language courses, which total 45 credits, and general education courses transferred in for 18 credits. The language programs have defined student learning outcomes for each course. The SLOs are detailed in the program outlines of the languages and the outcomes are included in the syllabi that students receive. Learning outcomes

are assessed through the course by unit tests and at the end of the courses more comprehensively by the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) and Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPI). (II.A.11)

DLIFLIC awards only associate degrees. The General Education core areas covered by DLIFLC instruction include humanities, critical thinking, and area studies, each at three units of credit. Students achieve completion of civic duty through service in the military and volunteer activities in the local community. The associate degree requires 18 General Education credits transferred in to meet a total of 63 credits. Acceptable General Education courses are determined by the Office of Registrar and the AA Degree Office through comparison of requirements to state university and community college programs. The Registrar noted they are forming a committee for a full review of the General Education requirements that also will include faculty, the ALO, and the Dean of Students, among others. The review is expected to be completed by May and will result in providing students with more detailed transfer credit information. (II.A.12, ER12)

The degree programs focus on foreign language studies as an area of inquiry, with layers of learning to attain higher proficiency levels in the language. The proficiencies are evaluated by the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) and Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPI). General Education requirements are transferred into DLIFLC. Syllabi for the courses follow a structure that includes student learning outcomes. (II.A.13)

DLIFLC graduates have specialized employment opportunities within the military, federal government, and private sector. Graduates receive a DLIFLC diploma and linguist certificate upon successful completion of the program. Those who complete additional general education requirements receive the Associate of Arts degree in the language of study. (II.A.14)

Students are not impacted when programs are terminated because programs are phased in or out as class cohorts begin or end. New program requirements apply to new cohorts. (II.A.15)

DLIFLC regularly evaluates its basic, intermediate, and advanced language courses and language programs through Quarterly Review and Analyses. The Quarterly Review and Analyses includes review of accomplishments, new initiatives, and challenges to drive improvement. Interviews with DLIFLC staff revealed that while the Quarterly Review and Analyses does identify courses due for curriculum redesign, it does not include a mechanism for prioritizing courses for curriculum revision or assigning resources to ensure timely completion. Annual program reviews encompass performance and accountability. Students are surveyed both at mid-term and end of course for feedback on the effectiveness of instruction. (II.A.16)

Conclusion

The Institute meets the Standard II.A, ER 9, 10, 11, and 12.

Institute Recommendations:

See Institute Recommendation 1

Institute Recommendation 3 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute ensure data collected in the evaluation process, including program review, the Interim Student Questionnaire (ISQ), and the End-of-Course Student Questionnaire (ESQ), is used in a consistent manner to inform decision-making. Further, as part of the regular evaluation process to improve institutional effectiveness, the team recommends that the Institute ensure that results of evaluation are widely communicated. (II.A.2, II.B.1, II.B.2)

STANDARD II.B – Library and Learning Support Services

General Observations

DLIFLC provides library and other learning support services to students and personnel responsible for student learning and support. The library's mission statement aligns with the institution's mission. This mission includes providing appropriate resources to support instructional programs and student learning. DLIFLC relies appropriately on faculty, librarians, and other professionals to select educational equipment and materials to support student learning. The Institute supports student learning through its Learning Centers, computer equipment, and library technology. DLIFLC uses additional third-party resources to complement its learning support services to support teaching and learning.

Findings and Evidence

The visit confirmed that DLIFLC provides appropriate and sufficient library resources to support its faculty and students. The Aiso Library avails 6,500 international newspapers, 20,000 books, 200 print periodicals, 50 scholarly journals, and 20 databases to all faculty and students at DLIFLC, including faculty teaching at remote Language Training Detachments. The library's website publicizes its resources and invites requests for purchasing new materials from faculty and students. Student Learning Services provides support classes ILS 101 and ILS 102 to prepare students to learning languages. Through interviews, the team determined the library to be disconnected from the academic schools of the Institute. Both Library staff and Institute leaders expressed interest in integrating the library more fully into the instructional programs of DLIFLC. (II.B.1)

The institution appropriately relies on faculty, librarians, and other professionals to inform the selection, maintenance of educational materials and equipment to support student learning. The Library recently revitalized the Library Acquisitions Advisory Board to discuss the collection's appropriateness, student learning needs, instructional needs, and faculty needs for publishing. The library uses faculty feedback to inform its collection development decisions, such as updating the serials subscription and redirecting the Russian language materials more suited to advanced studies of the language. The team suggests that the Institute explore the library's role in supporting the institutional goal of producing 2+2+2 and beyond "culturally based professional military linguists" as noted in the Action Plan. The instructional and learning activities to carry out the mission of higher competencies are the context in which the library may want to consider its role. (II.B.2)

The institution evaluates learning support services in the form of ILS 101 and ILS 102 courses. Evaluation of ILS 101 and 102 in 2014 led to improvements in their recent version; the data show student perception of the learning modules' relevance to their language learning. Through end user data such as circulation statistics and journal article downloads, the library makes informed decisions about its collection. The Interim Student Questionnaire (ISQ) and End of course Student Questionnaire (ESQ) are means by which the library and learning support

services may obtain feedback about their appropriateness, quantity, and effectiveness. Since these surveys do not contain questions about the library, they may not be productive venues for the library to obtain student feedback. The library has neither systematically evaluated its effectiveness since 2002, nor assessed how its resources, services, and activities contribute to student learning outcomes as articulated in the Institute's 2+2+2 and beyond goals. The Institute's Action Plan includes a systematic and regular evaluation of library resources and services for effectiveness, which the Institute may want to align with its program review and planning process. (II.B.3)

DLIFLC relies on, and collaborates with, other resources and it documents formal agreements. The library participates in the Federal Library and Information Network (FEDLINK) and the library of Congress Cooperative Acquisitions Program for procurement. Additionally, the Aiso Library has agreements with vendors such as OCLC, Baker and Taylor, Overdrive, and Boopsie mobile app to support its collection and delivery of library resources. The library has not regularly evaluated these services for effectiveness. (II.B.4, ER 17)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard II.B and ER 17.

Institute Recommendations:

See Institute Recommendation 1

See Institute Recommendation 2

See Institute Recommendation 3

Institute Recommendation 4 (Improvement): In order to improve effectiveness, the team recommends the Institute regularly assess library resources and services for their effectiveness and contribution to student learning outcomes including resources and services provided by third-party vendors and agreements. The results of the assessments will inform the unit's regular program reviews leading to improvement and connecting to resource allocation. (II.B.3, II.B.4)

STANDARD II.C – Student Support Services

General Observations

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center provides a wide range of services designed to support the students throughout their educational journey consistent with its mission. These support services are provided through a collaborative structure that includes the Presidio of Monterey (POM), U.S. Army Garrison (USAG), and DLIFLC. Further, the various support services are regularly assessed through formative and summative approaches. The Institute provides students with counseling and advising support throughout their educational program focused on academic improvement, personal wellness, and spiritual/non-spiritual support. Consistent with its mission, the Institute offers co-curricular programming and athletic programs designed to support the student throughout their program.

The Institute provides students with information regarding admission to the language program in the catalog, on the website, and onsite through advising/counseling support. Admission policies are consistent with the mission of the Institute and military service requirements. Information regarding admission, program and degree requirements and student support services are provided through mandatory student orientations, the college catalog, the website, individual student support, and the service unit.

Findings and Evidence

Students are provided with support services that are focused on the various quality of life issues that may be encountered during their program. This support is afforded to students through the provision of approximately twenty-five programs that include the Army Retention Office, Army Substance Abuse Program, Army Behavioral Health Clinic, Civilian Personnel Advisory Center, Family Housing, Religious Support, and many others outlined in the Institute's catalog and the website.

The Institute utilizes a variety of assessment methods designed to seek input from students at different phases of their educational journey. The Institute administers standardized student feedback surveys (i.e., ISQ/ESQ/ILS) that provide student feedback on instructional effectiveness, program effectiveness and quality of life support. The results from the surveys are analyzed by the Language Proficiency Assessment Directorate and routed to the appropriate department for continuous program improvement efforts within the respective areas of the language schools, the EEO, and the Army Garrison. The ISQ/ESQ feedback is maintained and monitored within the Language Proficiency Assessment Directorate Training Analysis Division to identify trends and follow up on action items identified. A coding system is used to identify issues that require immediate action (red flag) and those that need action but are not urgent (yellow flag). Additionally, the Student Learning Services department administers a pre- and post-test to assess the effectiveness of learning skills integrated into the classroom based on professional development provided to the instructors through ILS 101 and 102. Results of the

ILS pre- and post-test are provided to the schools, and evidence confirms that feedback is incorporated into the program review process with action items that lead to program improvement. Additionally, the language schools engage in Sensing Sessions held at the program midpoint and end of a semester. The sensing session is a time for students to meet with the Dean, and the military language instructor (MLI) to provide feedback on areas that include technology, facilities, homework, testing, and relationship to unit. In addition to feedback received through the ISQ/ESQ, the Interactive Customer Evaluation (ICE) is used to evaluate services provided through the Army Garrison. Additional forms of feedback may be provided by the student through the chain of command within their service units and/or to the Inspector General. Evaluative feedback received through the ISQ and ESQ has led to changes in transportation schedules and food choices in the dining facility to better support students during the evening hours. (II.C.1, II.C.2, ER 15)

The Institute provides support services in an accessible manner that includes online, via telephone, and in person. The Institute does not offer for-credit distance education programs or courses. Programs offered off site are continuing education options delivered in noncredit-bearing formats. (II.C.3, ER 15)

Consistent with its mission, the Institute offers co-curricular programming and athletic programs that include co-ed softball, volleyball, flag football, and soccer. Other sports include men's basketball and women's volleyball. The Price Fitness Center provides students with team sports that encourage unit participation at the intramural level. Other means of engagement in co-curricular activities include the Outdoor Recreation Program that offers a variety of outdoor activities and through the Hobson Student Activity Center, which provides pool tables, movie theaters and many more activities. The Institute provides programming that allows students to become engaged in specific needed areas, such as the Better Opportunities for Single Service Members (BOSS) council that is student led. (II.C.4)

The Institute provides students with counseling and advising support throughout their educational program focused on academic improvement, personal wellness, and spiritual/non-spiritual support. Specifically, the Institute provides students with counseling services through the following:

1. Advising through the Education Center with a focus on military education benefits.
2. Tailored advising through diagnostic assessment specialists located within the specific language schools with a focus on individualized learning plans based on improving academic performance.
3. Counseling from the teaching team with a focus on early alert issues that may hinder students' academic performance.

4. Academic advising through the Office of the Registrar/Division of Academic Administration with a focus on course requirements and degree completion.
5. Personal wellness counseling provided through the Army Community Service and the Presidio of Monterey U.S. Army Health Clinic and Behavioral Health Clinic.
6. Spiritual and non-spiritual counseling support provided through assigned chaplains via the Department of Defense.

Early alert systems are in place to notice the faculty teams when there is need for early intervention. The faculty team approach and faculty to student ratio lend themselves to discussing student progress on a consistent basis and providing necessary interventions to promote student success. Systems are in place to address student disenrollment for academic or administrative reasons that allow for a review by the Academic Attrition Review Board to make a determination for action. Actions include get-well plan, disenrollment, and recycle into a future class; however, the last option is rarely exercised.

A new proficiency level has been established at L2+/R2+/S2 and will become the new DLIFLC graduation standard for classes enrolling in 2022. As a result, the Institute has outlined in the Quality Focused Essay/Action Plan 1, plans to provide students with counseling and intervention support earlier and more often, and as well as develop new student engagement models. In tandem with this effort, the Quality Focused Essay also addresses faculty professional development in Action Plan 2. The Institute recognizes and articulates the need for professional development for its faculty to support the students in achieving higher levels of proficiency.

Professional development training is provided on a consistent basis for those individuals serving in the role of advisor through the Faculty Support Division and School of Continuing Education. (II.C.5)

The Institute has adopted and adheres to admission policies that are consistent with its mission. In 2017, the Institute revised its mission to clearly identify the population served. Further, as members of the various branches of the U.S. Military, students are admitted to each branch of the military following their respective admission protocols. In determining admission to the various language programs, potential students are required to take the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB). DLAB scores and training needs determined by the Armed Forces are used for student language program assignment.

The sequencing of courses is intentional and prescribed with students receiving an individualized program plan that outlines necessary requirements to include the transferring in of coursework to satisfy general education requirements not included within the language program. As part of the required student orientation, students are provided with general information regarding the requirements for the associate degree, as well as options to complete the general education portion of the degree. Students may satisfy the general education requirement through

DANTES/CLEP, external coursework, and college/university partnerships. Advising and counseling is provided through the Education Center and the Office of the Registrar regarding requirements for an associate degree. Information on program and degree requirements is available through the catalog and website. In order to inform students of the counseling and advising support available to them as part of their educational program, this information is covered in the mandatory orientations, service unit briefings, and is available in the Institute's catalog and on the website. (II.C.6, ER 16)

Admission is based on the needs of the military. The Defense Language Aptitude Battery serves as the primary method of student selection for admission into the various language programs. The Institute has consistently disaggregated data from DLAB to establish validity. In 2015, the Institute partnered with the University of Maryland Center for the Advanced Study of Language to develop the DLAB2, which incorporates information from the Vocational Ability Battery (ASVAB) required of all military recruits as part of their military processing. Commencing in 2016, the DLAB2 began being piloted at Military Entrance Processing Stations. Once a sufficient number of graduates is available who have taken both tests, appropriate analysis will be conducted to determine the DLAB2's predictive ability for student success. (II.C.7)

Student records are maintained in a secure, permanent, and confidential format as overseen by the Division of Academic Administration Academic Records Office. Authorized personnel are provided with access to student records in a read only format in an electronic and encrypted format upon approval of the Deputy Chief of Staff Operations. The Presidio of Monterey Enterprise Center is responsible for performing full backup of student records nightly. Records are released through proper military protocol and regulation under the Privacy Act of 1974. Employees involved with student records participate in annual training and review of existing practices. (II.C.8)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard II.C, ER 15, and ER 16.

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD III.A – Human Resources

General Observations

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center ensures the integrity and quality of its programs and services by employing administrators, faculty, and staff, who are qualified by appropriate education, training, and experience to provide and support programs and services. All faculty member positions are explicitly linked to DLIFLC's mission and goals. Employees responsible for educational programs and services possess qualifications in their specific areas to ensure institutional effectiveness and academic quality. There is adequate staff with appropriate qualifications to support the effective educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations of the Institute. DLIFLC evaluates employees to assess their effectiveness and to encourage improvement. DLIFLC establishes, publishes, and adheres to written personnel policies and procedures that are available for review, and that are fair and equitable. The Institute ensures ethical conduct for all personnel. There are adequate opportunities for employee professional development, which are consistent with the institutional mission and based on evolving pedagogy, technology, and learning needs. The Institute ensures the security and confidentiality of all personnel records.

Findings and Evidence

DLIFLC ensures that the job application process for hiring civilian administrators, faculty, and staff incorporates required education, training, and experience that supports the overall integrity and quality of the Institute's educational programs and student support services. Vacancies are posted on the Federal Government's web-based job advertisement and application program, known as USAJOBS. To ensure job descriptions are directly related to institutional mission and goals, they are written collaboratively by the DLIFLC hiring official and the local Civilian Personnel Advisory Center (CPAC). Position descriptions are validated by the individual faculty or staff member during the annual evaluation cycle. Job descriptions are also periodically reviewed by DLIFLC management to ensure current job assignment details are relevant. (III.A.1)

Tenure, tenure-track, and adjunct faculty must all meet minimum education and experience based qualifications. Minimum qualifications include professional experience, discipline expertise, level of assignment, teaching skills, scholarly activities, and potential to contribute to the institutional mission. All faculty member positions are directly linked to the DLIFLC and U.S. Army missions through carefully developed standards and goals. Position descriptions include the assessment of learning, as well as the development and adaptation of classroom and other teaching materials. All newly hired faculty attend a mandatory pre-service course, the Instructor Certification Course, to develop their pedagogy. (III.A.2, ER 14)

Administrators and other employees responsible for educational programs and services possess the necessary qualifications to perform duties required to sustain institutional effectiveness and academic quality. Qualifications for all administrators and other employees responsible for

educational programs and services are clearly stated in position descriptions and job announcements and are developed with the intent of sustaining and/or improving the Institute's institutional effectiveness and academic quality. The knowledge and skills required for each administrative position are identified in the job announcements. Military employees are assigned through the U.S. Government and may be based on background, performance, and any linguistic or cultural expertise. (III.A.3)

Faculty, staff, and administrators must submit proof of education in order to be hired at the minimum educational level for a specified rank. A human resources specialist from CPAC verifies the degree and the degree granting institution's accreditation then determines if the school is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Candidates who received their education outside of the U.S. have their transcripts validated through an approved member organization of the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES). (III.A.4)

The Institute ensures the effectiveness of its human resources by evaluating all personnel systematically and at stated intervals. DLIFLC evaluates its personnel on an annual basis in accordance with a systematic process regulated by the Department of Defense (DoD). Annual appraisals are used together with the employees' Individual Development Plans to clearly define institutional mission priorities; to identify expected performance standards of the employee; and to capture and document employee contributions. Supervisors counsel employees with documented performance issues throughout the appraisal period and provide detailed feedback on the particular area(s) needing improvement and assistance to achieve success. (III.A.5)

Standard III.A.6 is no longer applicable.

DLIFLC maintains a sufficient number of qualified faculty to assure quality fulfillment of essential responsibilities to achieve the institution's mission and goals. Faculty staffing is driven by student enrollments that are forecast two years in advance and adjusted quarterly to meet target numbers of trained linguists. The Faculty to student ratio is very low, between six to eight students for every two instructors. DLIFLC may employ contract faculty for short periods of time to meet unexpected teacher shortages. (III.A.7, ER 14)

Ninety-nine percent of DLIFLC faculty are full-time tenured or tenure track faculty members. All faculty, regardless of employment status, receive an annual performance evaluation as long as they have 90 days of rated time within a rating period. (III.A.8)

DLIFLC administrative staffing levels are determined by the student loads. The Institute follows prescribed hiring procedures to ensure employees in staff and administrative positions possess the appropriate qualifications to carry out the Institute's mission. The Institute's programs and services have sufficient staff with appropriate qualifications and training to support the educational, technological, physical, and administrative operations. (III.A.9, ER 8)

The Institute maintains a sufficient number of administrators with appropriate expertise to provide effective and continuous leadership and services to support the institutional mission. DLIFLC's administrative structure is extensively detailed in the Institute's Organization and Functions regulatory document. DLIFLC ensures that administrators have the preparation and experience to support the Institute's purpose and mission by employing rigorous hiring, reassignment, and evaluation practices. (III.A.10)

DLIFLC personnel policies are derived from the Code of Federal Regulations, Office of Personnel Management, Department of Defense, and U.S. Army regulations. Instructions and guidance are reviewed and approved, at a minimum, every three years by the Commandant. Personnel policies and related information are available for review, and there are provisions for employees to send comments and suggestions for improvement. Commandant-approved policies and procedures are reviewed by the Faculty Union, giving additional review to help determine the impact and implementation of the policy or regulation. Personnel policies are consistent with the overall educational mission of the Institute and are reviewed to ensure compliance with other related policies. Policies are disseminated through various means including campus-wide email and the Institute's intranet website. (III.A.11)

The Institute hires a diverse faculty to support its intended mission and strives to create a positive support structure where multicultural and multiethnic faculty can thrive. Through U.S. Government laws and regulations, the Institute protects the rights of its employees. In order to monitor the practices and to create and maintain programs that support its diverse staff, the Institute has an Equal Opportunity (EO) office for its military personnel and an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) office for its civilian personnel. Employee complaints are monitored through the EO and EEO offices. Further, the EO and the EEO offices continually work to promote diversity programs, as well as to provide guidance and support to the diverse populations at DLIFLC. (III.A.12)

DLIFLC requires ethical conduct from all personnel. Employed as Department of Army Civilians, DLIFLC employees comply with the Department of Defense core values of leadership, professionalism, and technical knowledge through dedication to duty, integrity, ethics, honor, courage, and loyalty. Training materials and guidelines are provided to all DLIFLC employees. Ethics are incorporated into every aspect of DLIFLC employee behavior beginning with employee orientation. Employees who fail to observe or uphold appropriate ethical standards are subject to a range of disciplinary actions up to and including termination. (III.A.13)

The Institute builds into its budget support for a wide range of professional development programs and activities for faculty, administrative support staff, and civilian management personnel. Instructors must complete a four week pre-service training, which includes instruction and practicum components. Certification to teach is only given after all teacher training requirements are met. The Army Training, Education and Development System (ACTEDS) is

available to all personnel and offers a range of professional development courses for faculty, staff, and administrators. Evaluation of professional development activities are conducted in various ways and data collected, as well as suggestions, are used to make adjustments to subsequent training sessions. (III.A.14)

Employee records storage containing sensitive information complies with regulatory requirements, to include physical and electronic security guidelines. Employees have adequate access to review their personnel information that may be used for assignments within DLIFLC, to include advancement and tenure competitions. (III.A.15)

Conclusion

The Institute meets the Standard. (III.A).

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD III.B – Physical Resources

General Observations

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center has sufficient, clean and safe facilities constructed to ensure effective utilization and the continuing quality necessary to support its programs and achieve its mission. The U.S. Army Garrison, Presidio of Monterey (USAG POM) is the organization responsible for the land and facilities assigned to DLIFLC activities in Monterey. In consultation with the Institute, the Garrison plans and evaluates its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, utilizing relevant data.

Findings and evidence

The Presidio sits between the cities of Monterey to the east and Pacific Grove to the west. The physical plant includes classrooms, offices, barracks, and other academic support facilities spread across 392 acres. DLIFLC has safe and sufficient physical resources that are maintained to ensure access, safety, and security. The Institute operates from a protected military base and all aspects of physical resources are planned by the Department of Defense. DLIFLC has a planning board, the Real Property Planning Board (RPPB), which has a system for recommending improvements of facilities. (III.B.1)

The USAG POM, with input from DLIFLC, plans, builds, maintains, and upgrades or replaces its physical resources, including facilities, equipment, land, and other assets in a manner that ensures effective use and continuing quality necessary to support its mission. The Garrison and Institute integrate its institutional planning with physical resources planning. Physical resources support the curriculum and services necessary to achieve the mission. (III.B.2)

The Institute ensures the feasibility and effectiveness of its physical resources in supporting institutional programs and services. The Institute engages in effective planning and evaluation of its facilities and equipment on a regular basis, taking utilization and other relevant data into account. To ensure fullest utilization of existing facilities, the Institute calculates the number of classrooms available in each facility and updates the data as necessary to record any changes due to renovations, new construction, or repurposing. (III.B.3)

Long-range capital planning is done to support institutional improvement goals and reflect projections of the total cost of ownership of new facilities and equipment. The planning process for capital improvement, including new construction or major renovation, for DLIFLC is regulated by U.S. Army and Department of Defense directives applicable to Army installations. Included in planning are classrooms, parking, dining, housing, administration, ADA compliance, and a healthy working environment. (III.B.4.)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard III.B.

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD III.C – Technology Resources

General Observations

DLIFLC emphasizes the effective use of technology in support of teaching and learning, student success, and administrative functions. Technology services, support, hardware, and software meet the institution’s needs and advance its mission of serving students. Technology support is provided to faculty, staff, and students through directorates and divisions that oversee faculty, curriculum, and technology program development for all DLIFLC instructional locations that include the Presidio of Monterey (POM), Department of Defense Center (DoD Center), select Language Training Detachments (LTDs), and virtual learning environments.

The technology infrastructure ensures support for existing technology requirements, new technologies, and base expansion. Communication and coordination of technology needs and services to properly support and administer institutional-level computing and technology is a challenge at the Institute.

Findings and Evidence

Technology services, professional support, facilities, hardware, and software are appropriate and adequate to support the institution’s management and operational functions, academic programs, teaching and learning, and support services. In its action plan, DLIFLC identifies communication and coordination needs of the Institute’s technology services to properly support and administer institutional-level computing and technology. DLIFLC is establishing a fully operational communication system to reduce redundant efforts and concentrate resources. At the Institute, there are multiple ways communication across teams occurs to convey resource needs and to inform decision making. Examples include requests for free apps through the Help Desk that may require additional resources, resulting in a request being routed through the chain of command to management; department meetings where teaching teams discuss needs, and deans identify patterns of issues or needs; and deans articulate a staffing need for carrying out a new directive for advanced language instruction since the deans’ units already have priorities that require additional personnel.

The Executive Technology Steering Committee reviews requests, assesses whether to “make, buy, or reuse,” and prioritizes resource requests based on alignment with the Institute’s goals and objectives. The Chief Technology Officer maintains a portfolio of IT requests, and the Committee communicates meeting decisions to the broader community. The Institute may want to explore using the Campaign Plan via SharePoint to house prioritized projects and to communicate project status across teams. (III.C.1).

DLIFLC continuously plans for, updates and replaces technology to ensure its technological infrastructure, quality, and capacity are adequate to support its mission, operations, programs, and services. The Institute follows established processes to ensure ongoing resourcing in support of its technological infrastructure. The five-year IT Strategic Plan identifies institutional goals, needs, and support. Language teaching requires a degree of freedom at the faculty level to integrate cutting edge curricula and teaching methodology into the classroom. In its Action Plan, DLIFLC identified that in order to continue to coordinate the planning process, the Institute would benefit from a defined dialogue between the academic programs and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Information Technology (DCSIT) to ensure that the infrastructure can fully support instructional technology initiatives. Additionally, such a systematic communication would support the team's effort in completing the 2022 Tiger Team recommendations and reducing redundancies. (III.C.2)

DLIFLC ensures that technology resources at all locations where it offers courses, programs, and services are implemented and maintained to assure reliable access, safety, and security. In its Action Plan, DLIFLC identified extending the EDU network to the common areas within the barracks buildings to support out-of-class assignments. Language training labs are an integral part of DLI's language program for student assessment: they have special servers to allow student-faculty interactions. The Sakai learning management system and SharePoint are available to DLI students and over 40,000 linguists worldwide. The help ticket system shows a clearly defined escalation protocol for user support. (III.C.3)

DLIFLC provides appropriate instruction and support for faculty, staff, students, and administrators, in the effective use of technology and technology systems related to its programs, services, and institutional operations. The Institute provides mandatory training in the learning management system, train-the-trainer at faculty point of need, and self-paced life-long learning through online training. The Institute has action objectives to review the existing technology support system, to identify training needs and prioritize resources accordingly, and to ensure teachers have the opportunity and time to attend training. (III.C.4)

DLIFLC has policies and procedures that guide the appropriate use of technology in the teaching and learning processes. (III.C.5)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard III.C.

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD III.D – Financial Resources

General Observations

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center's financial resources are sufficient to support and sustain student learning programs and services, and to improve institutional effectiveness. DLIFLC is funded through the US Department of Defense and thereby required to identify how funding requests support the Institute's mission and goals. This process ensures the integration of institutional planning with financial planning. DLIFLC uses institutional data as a means in developing the budget to ensure all obligations are met. The Institute's financial systems are sound, and strong internal controls are in place to ensure financial integrity. The Institute's use of financial resources supports student learning programs and services. DLIFLC is not audited as an independent organization, but as a subordinate organization under the U.S. Army's enterprise audit process. DLIFLC has sufficient funds to maintain stability and to ensure excellent student learning programs and services. Contractual agreements are in direct support of the mission and goals of the Institute through the military.

Findings and Evidence

Through the Army Command channels, the Institute utilizes an Army wide enterprise resource planning system designed to comply with congressional mandates to ensure financial integrity and oversight. The Institute utilizes a detailed resource requirement calculation based on the needs of the military organizations they serve. The Institute has a clearly documented funding base and financial resources to support student learning programs and services and to improve institutional effectiveness. DLIFLC utilizes the Army's General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS), a web-enabled financial, asset, and accounting management system which allows for audited financial statements. GFEBS is an Army wide enterprise resource planning system designed to ensure financial integrity and oversight. (III.D.1, ER 18)

DLIFLC is funded annually through Congressional appropriations to the Department of Defense and the Army. The DoD follows a planning and resource allocation process which has four phases; Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE). The planning stage identifies operational requirements, including ongoing and emerging needs and allows for input and participation from constituents. The planning and resource allocation process is directly linked to student enrollments through established formulas. This ongoing planning process requires that the Institute identify its upcoming mission and goals to support them accordingly, ensuring the integration of institutional planning with financial planning. (III.D.2)

DLIFLC has clearly defined processes for financial planning and budget development. The Institute's budget cycle, PPBE, has distinct stages: program years; budget development years; and budget execution years. Mission requirements, higher headquarters' priorities, cost estimating models, and historical expenditure data are used to estimate resource requirements for each program year. The Program and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) is comprised of

representatives from across the Institute who meet at various levels to review the allocation of funds and expenditure rates. The Commandant is actively involved in planning, which includes ensuring that resource allocation is based on identified priorities. PBAC identifies and validates unfinanced requirements, and recommends adjustments to the funding levels and/or priorities to the Commandant. (III.D.3)

DLIFLC's institutional planning reflects a realistic assessment of financial resource availability and expenditure requirements. DLIFLC uses the PPBE process as a continuous cycle of resource planning. Key elements used for the development of the budget include projected enrollment data, faculty salary obligations, cost of living adjustments, support services, and contractual obligations. The PBAC is the primary forum where stakeholders can establish funding priorities to achieve the Institute's mission and goals. (III.D.4)

DLIFLC uses the Army Manager's Internal Control Program (MICP) to support its internal control systems. The MICP requires annual inspections by designated internal control evaluators. Evaluators complete compliance checklists in areas such as, travel operations, purchase cards, and the distribution and execution of appropriated funds. The checklists are then aggregated and reported to DLIFLC's higher headquarters, the Combined Arms Center. Their financial management system requires that the Institute be audit ready on a daily basis. Accurate and timely financial information is reported regularly across the Institute to key stakeholders and decision makers. (III.D.5)

DLIFLC's training funds used to support student learning programs and services in FY 2017 was 80% of the total funds received. To ensure funds are allocated in a manner that will realistically achieve the Institute's mission and goals, DLIFLC utilizes several planning and input mechanisms. Annually each organization within DLIFLC is required to request funds that will ensure appropriate support of student learning. The Institute's budget accurately reflects spending and is used to inform stakeholders of expenditures and available funding throughout the year to facilitate strategic planning. (III.D.6)

DLIFLC's audit falls under the Department of the Army's enterprise-level audit system in accordance with federal law, which requires that federal agencies produce auditable financial statements. The Institute ensures audit responses to findings are comprehensive, timely, and communicated to senior leadership. (III.D.7)

DLIFLC uses the MICP, which reflects the processes and procedures outlined in the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act and Army TRADOC regulations for management controls. An annual review is performed and timely responses to areas of deficiencies are required. (III.D.8)

DLIFLC receives its revenues through the Department of Army's Annual Funding Program, which provides the Institute with monthly allotments. This method of providing funding does not

pose cash flow difficulties. In the event of cash flow problems, DLIFLC does have the option of going to higher headquarters, TRADOC, for additional funds. TRADOC distributes additional funds to meet emerging language training requirements. (III.D.9)

DLIFLC practices effective oversight of finances through financial control mechanisms, such as MICP and the General Fund Enterprise Business (GFEBS). DLIFLC must complete quarterly accounting reviews to verify accounting is in accordance with standard operating procedures. The goal of the accounting review is to increase the Institute's ability to utilize all appropriations before they expire, and to ensure remaining obligations are valid. The review ensures that all accounting transactions are properly recorded, in an active status, and are in agreement with supporting documentation. (III.D.10)

The Institute's level of financial resources is sufficient to ensure both short-term and long-term financial priorities are met. The Institute's student load is determined by projected military needs in the future. Student load numbers are entered into DLIFLC's budget models to obtain appropriate funding and personnel in support of military missions. (III.D.11)

DLIFLC does not identify long-term liabilities and future obligations because congressional funds are appropriated for one fiscal year that must be expended within the same fiscal year. Planning for payments of long-term liabilities and obligations, such as OPEB, are not handled by the Institute. The calculation and payment of OPEB is the responsibility of the Federal Government. (III.D.12)

The Institute does not incur debt of any kind, so there is no need to allocate resources for repayment of any locally incurred debt instruments that could affect the financial conditions of the institution. (III.D.13)

DLIFLC only received appropriated funds. By law, all appropriated funds must be spent for their designated purpose. DLIFLC does not have any auxiliary activities, fund-raising efforts, and/or grants. (III.D.14)

DLIFLC students are paid military staff and therefore do not pay tuition or have student loans to be repaid. (III.D.15)

DLIFLC does not enter into contractual agreements directly; the Institute relies on government contracting agencies as appropriate. When contractual agreements are found to be necessary, they are consistent with the mission and goals of the Institute and are governed by federal policies. All contractual assistance is routed through the DLIFLC's higher headquarters, the Combined Arms Center, to ensure regulations are followed. The Combined Arms Center must approve all contracts before initiating the contracted services. Contracting activities are monitored and executed to ensure compliance with federal guidelines. (III.D.16)

Conclusion

The Institute meets the Standard. (III.D, ER 18).

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD IV.A – Decision-Making and Processes

General Observations

DLIFLC fosters an environment that ensures representation of all constituencies in governance and values the input of these constituents in improving institutional practices, programs, and services. DLIFLC enacts policies and procedures that clearly define the role of its constituencies in decision-making including recommendations about curriculum and student learning programs and services. Governance processes and decisions at DLIFLC are documented and widely communicated across the institution, including the regular evaluation of these processes to assure their integrity and effectiveness.

Findings and Evidence

DLIFLC's current shared governance model, the Parthenon, was introduced at a Shared Governance Plenary Meeting in 2016. The Institute's various stakeholder groups have a clear and specific tie to the participatory governance process. The bylaws of each representative group articulate their role in the Institute as well as how they disseminate information. The Shared Governance Guide codifies this integral role that inclusive and innovative governance plays in the success of the institution. Students, faculty, staff, and Institute leadership work together to create a climate that fosters institutional excellence. (IV.A.1)

The Institute establishes and implements policy and procedures to ensure faculty, staff, administrator, and leadership participation in decision-making. These guidelines are outlined in DLIFLC regulations, which establish the structure and responsibilities of the organization. The Institute layers its unique approach to comprehensive participation in governance. Shared governance groups are codified, ensuring their continued contributions. Students are regularly surveyed for valuable input, and special topics committees, or Tiger Teams, are convened as needed. (IV.A.2)

The Institute has clearly defined roles for stakeholder groups that ensure broad, participation in institutional governance. Although DLIFLC is a military institution, senior leadership, together with representative groups, has created the Shared Governance Guide to better incorporate all constituents in the decision making process. There are various ways stakeholders voice their contributions to shared decision-making. (IV.A.3)

The Institute has clearly defined structures for faculty and academic administrators to make recommendations about curriculum and program services. Responsibilities are outlined in the performance elements and standards for each position and clearly articulate the vital role that each plays in ensuring the delivery of high-quality curricula designed to meet the Institutes program goals. (IV.A.4)

DLIFLC ensures that relevant perspectives are included in decision-making through its shared governance model. Relevant perspectives are integrated into decision-making to facilitate timely action on institutional plans, policies, curricular change, and other key considerations. Faculty

are represented by the Academic Senate and the Faculty Advisory Councils, which are clearly integrated into the Institute's decision-making process. The Institute demonstrates strong collaboration among the military and civilian components of the Institute. (IV.A.5)

Processes and decisions are shared across the Institute using a variety of methods. These include representative group activities, Quarterly Review and Analyses, and Town Hall meetings. Additionally, the Institute's Campaign Plan provides bi-weekly opportunities for information sharing and initiative updates. (IV.A.6)

DLIFLC incorporates both internal and external assessments to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of its decision-making processes. A shared governance review began in May 2016 and is ongoing. The Commandant is briefed on the review quarterly. DLIFLC representative groups review and update operating procedures ensuring alignment with the Institute's mission. Results are shared in open meetings. The Institute has identified the value of this endeavor in its QFE as a way to support increased student proficiency. (IV.A.7)

Conclusion

The Institute meets the standard. (IV.A)

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD IV.B – Chief Executive Officer

General Observations

The institutional chief executive officer is the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Commandant, a U.S. Army Colonel. The Commandant has primary responsibility for the quality of the Defense Language Institute and is responsible for driving improvement within the institution. In doing so, the Commandant oversees a sound administrative structure with a clear chain of command and delegation of responsibility. The Commandant has adequate authority to make personnel decisions to support the Institute's mission. The Commandant also provides effective leadership in planning, budgeting, assessing institutional effectiveness, and is primarily responsible for the institution's performance relative to the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, and other commission policies. (ER 4)

Findings and Evidence

The Commandant has primary responsibility for all aspects of the DLIFLC academic experience, outcomes, and institutional structure. In 2016, the Commandant provided the vision, goals, and strategic framework for the 2+/2+/2 initiative, conceptualized as the Parthenon, and then operationalized it into a five-year strategic plan. The Commandant communicates the importance of a culture of evidence and a focus on student learning through regular verbal and written updates, such as the Commandant-chaired Commander's Update Brief and Academic Leadership Update. (IV.B.1)

As the chief executive officer, the Commandant oversees both military and academic leadership that are reflective of the institution's purpose, size, and complexity. Under Title 10, the Commandant has discretionary authority to take appropriate personnel actions to support the missions of the Institute, including such matters as hiring at the Associate Professor level and higher, advancements, and compensation. This authority may be delegated directly to the Assistant Commandant or Chief of Staff. When authority is delegated, it is done appropriately and responsibilities of the positions are clearly outlined. DLIFLC regularly evaluates its administrative structure to assess the effectiveness of its organization and to determine that staffing is aligned to the mission. (IV.B.2)

The Commandant is responsible for developing and implementing the annual Campaign Plan, a comprehensive, systematic, and integrated planning process with input from appropriate stakeholders and community members. The Campaign Plan identifies institutional performance standards for student achievement, institutional priorities, and ongoing effectiveness measurements in achieving stated goals. In response to a Department of Defense mandate to increase student achievement standards, the Commandant engaged the community to identify methods to meet the new standards as part of a strategic planning process. (IV.B.3)

The Commandant holds the primary leadership role for accreditation at the Institute. The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) is assigned by the Commandant to oversee the process and ensure that the Institute meets or exceeds eligibility requirements, accreditation standards, and commission policies at all times. During the self-evaluation process, the Commandant chairs the Accreditation Steering Committee and receives bi-weekly reports from the ALO on accreditation activities. The Commandant also communicates the purpose and importance of accreditation to the broader institution community. (IV.B.4)

The Commandant is responsible for implementing the policies directed by the Commanding General, Combined Arms Center and for ensuring compliance with all relevant laws and regulations that provide guidance on the Institute's management and operations. The Commandant maintains responsibility for fiscal management of the Institute and does not delegate it to the Deputy Chief of Staff of Resource Management (DCSRM). The DCSRМ serves in an advisory role and action officer for the management of fiscal resources and coordinates with the Commandant through weekly meetings and during periodic Department of Defense audits. (IV.B.5)

The Commandant works and communicates effectively with the communities served by the Institute. Regularly scheduled Command Chats and Town Halls provide face-to-face opportunities for the Commandant to answer questions and provide information. The Commandant meets regularly with various other communities served by the Institute such as the Defense Language Steering Committee, Defense Language Curriculum Working and Testing Groups, and the Defense Language National Security Education Office. (IV.B.6)

Conclusion

The Institute meets the Standard. (IV.B)

Institute Recommendation

None

STANDARD IV.C – Governing Board

General Observations

Governance roles are defined in operating procedures and are designed to make recommendations that support student learning programs and services and improve institutional effectiveness. Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the Institute. The team has reviewed the distinctive nature of the governance structures of this federally operated institution and has determined that the core principles of Standards IV.C are met through the Institute's unique Board of Visitors. The governing board provides feedback to the Commandant on leadership within the purview of its advisory capacity through established meetings.

Findings and Evidence

DLIFLC has a governing board, called the Board of Visitors (BoV). Due to the military nature of the Institute, the BoV is a Federal Advisory committee and has no authority over, or responsibility for, either policy or financial stability. The BoV serves in an advisory capacity and provides input and feedback. The Board's primary role is to serve as an advisory panel and independent sounding board, furnishing constructive input to the Institute's leadership through the AEAC. (IV.C.1, ER 7)

The Board of Visitors acts as a collective advisory. Board decisions and recommendations are made as a collective entity. (IV.C.2)

The Board of Visitors does not select or formally evaluate the Commandant (Chief Executive Officer) of DLIFLC. The Board of Visitors does provide feedback to the Commandant on leadership within the purview of its advisory capacity through the established meeting process. (IV.C.3)

The Board of Visitors is an advisory body that follows the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) regulations which stipulate membership diversity that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions. The BoV assists the Commandant in ensuring that DLIFLC fulfills its mission. (IV.C.4, ER 7)

As an advisory committee, the BoV does not hold ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, or financial integrity; however, the BoV makes recommendations to the Commandant through the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC), which serves as the parent committee to the DLIFLC BoV. The BoV advises and makes recommendations with regard to the Institute's mission as outlined in its Operating Procedures, to include: academic policies, staff and faculty development, student success indicators, curricula, educational methodology and objectives, program effectiveness, instructional methods, research and academic administration. (IV.C.5)

The BoV's operating procedures are posted on the FACA database as well as the DLIFLC.edu website. These operating procedures include the BoV's size, duties, responsibilities, and structure. (IV.C.6)

The BoV acts in a manner consistent with its operating procedures. The BoV assesses its procedures and bylaws for their effectiveness in fulfilling the institute's mission and revises them as necessary. The BoV reviews their procedures on an as needed basis; the last review was in December 2017. (IV.C.7)

The BoV regularly reviews student learning outcomes and provides recommendations and observations to the Institute on sustained, continuous quality improvement. Each Board meeting includes an item relevant to improving academic quality and student learning and achievement. (IV.C.8)

The BoV engages in regular, ongoing, trainings and orientations including structured orientation for new Board Members; a structured orientation for new Board members; formal ethics training on an annual basis from the Staff Judge Advocate; and Key presentations during each meeting on critical issues to ensure that the Board maintains a current understanding of said issues to include academic initiatives, administrative structure, and accreditation. (IV.C.9)

The Board of Visitors (BoV) has a process for board evaluation. The BoV regularly evaluates its practices and performance, including full participation in board training, and makes public the results. The results are used to improve board performance, academic quality, and institutional effectiveness. The Board reviews past recommendations and receives an update from DLI on actions taken based on the recommendations. (IV.C.10)

The Board of Visitors (BoV) upholds a code of ethics and conflict of interest policy, and individual board members adhere to the code. The board has a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code and implements it when necessary. A majority of the board members have no employment, family, ownership, or other personal financial interest in the institution. Board member interests are disclosed and do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution. (IV.C.11, ER 7)

The Board of Visitors (BoV) is limited by statute to serve as a policy recommending body. As a Federal Advisory Committee, the BoV makes observation addressing the Commandant's leadership as well as institutional performance. (IV.C.12)

The Board of Visitors (BoV) is informed about the Eligibility Requirements, the Accreditation Standards, Commission policies, accreditation processes, and the college's accredited status, and

supports through policy the college's efforts to improve and excel. The BoV participates in evaluation of governing board roles and functions in the accreditation process. (IV.C.13)

Conclusion

The Institute meets Standard IV.C.

Institute Recommendation

None