**Peer Review Team Report**

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

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a focused site visit to DLIFLC February 24 – 27, 2025. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its June 2025 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

Dr. Chris Vitelli
Superintendent/President, Merced College
Team Chair

# Table of Contents

# Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)

## Peer Review Team Roster – Team ISER Review

Dr. Chris Vitelli, Team Chair
Merced College
Superintendent/President

Dr. Kimberly R. Rogers, Vice Chair
President
Contra Costa College

**ACADEMIC MEMBERS**
Cara Kreit
Faculty
College of Marin

Dr. Richard Douglas Cortes
Faculty/Counselor
Glendale Community College

**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS**
Dr. Maria L. Villagomez
Santa Barbara City College
Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Academic Affairs

**ACCJC STAFF LIAISON**
Kevin Bontenbal
Vice President
ACCJC

# Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)

## Peer Review Team Roster – Focused Site Visit

Dr. Chris Vitelli, Team Chair
Merced College
Superintendent/President

Dr. Kimberly R. Rogers, Vice Chair
Contra Costa College
President

**ACADEMIC MEMBERS**
Cara Kreit
Faculty
College of Marin

Dr. Richard Douglas Cortes
Faculty/Counselor
Glendale Community College

**ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS**
Dr. Maria L. Villagomez
Santa Barbara City College
Assistant Superintendent/Vice President of Academic Affairs

**ACCJC STAFF LIAISON**
Kevin Bontenbal
Vice President
ACCJC

# Purpose of Focused Site Visit and Summary Analysis

INSTITUTION:  Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC)

DATES OF VISIT:  February 24 – 27, 2025

TEAM CHAIR:  Dr. Chris Vitelli

**Purpose of the Focused Site Visit**
This Peer Review Team Report is based on the findings of the peer review team which conducted its evaluation and analysis over a two-semester comprehensive peer review process. In October 2024, the team conducted Team ISER Review (formative component) to identify where the Institution meets Standards and to identify Core Inquiries which specify areas of attention for the Focused Site Visit (summative component). The Core Inquiries are appended to this report.  The team chair and vice chair held a pre-Focused Site Visit meeting with the institution CEO on October 22, 2024, to discuss updates since the Team ISER Review and to plan for the Focused Site Visit.

A five-member peer review team conducted a Focused Site Visit to DLIFLC for the purpose of completing its Peer Review Team Report and determination of whether the Institution continues to meet Accreditation Standards, Eligibility Requirements, Commission Policies, and U.S. Department of Education regulations. During the Focused Site Visit, team members met with approximately 100 faculty, administrators, classified staff and students in formal meetings, group interviews and individual interviews.  Team members also met with the DLIFLC Board of Advisors from the Institution to discuss decision-making and advisory processes and effectiveness.  The team held an open forum which was well attended and provided the institution community and others to share their thoughts with members of the Focused Site Visit team.  The team evaluated how well DLIFLC  is achieving its stated purposes, providing recommendations for quality assurance and institutional improvement.  The team thanks the Institution's staff for hosting the Focused Site Visit, coordinating meetings, providing additional documentation, and ensuring a smooth and collegial process.

**Summary Analysis**
The team found that DLIFLC has a rich history rooted in the military presence on the Monterey Peninsula, dating back to Spanish colonization in 1602.  The Institution traces its origins to 1941, when it began as a secret Japanese language school supporting U.S. efforts during World War II.  Over the decades, DLIFLC has expanded its language offerings and now serves approximately 2,000 multiservice students annually, most of whom are under 25 and preparing for intelligence missions.  Situated on the historic Presidio of Monterey, the Institution continues to evolve, offering critical language training to support U.S. military operations worldwide.

DLIFLC is deeply committed to all service members and its mission.  The Institute recognizes that fair treatment, access, and opportunity are essential to the success of its diverse student population.  By fostering this environment, DLIFLC values every student's contribution and perspective, ensuring they play an active role in decision-making processes.  The Institute's strategic focus on mission excellence, continuous process improvement, and adaptability ensures it meets the evolving demands of language education while supporting the National Defense Strategy.

The team was highly impressed with DLIFLC's commitment to its mission and the student success outcomes it achieves. Several unique practices stood out during the team's observations of the Institution:

- **Exceptional Student Success Rates and Outcomes:** The Institution demonstrates remarkable student achievement, reflecting the effectiveness of its educational model.

- **Individualized Student Support Services:** DLIFLC's proactive approach to early intervention and tailored support services ensures that students receive the necessary assistance to succeed and persist in their studies.

- **Commitment to Mission and Values:** As an Institution of the United States Army, DLIFLC plays a crucial role in preparing service members for specialized foreign language missions. The dedication to fostering soldiers who embody commitment, adaptability, integrity, and respect is commendable.

- **Strong Faculty and Leadership:** The faculty's dedication to student learning, combined with small class sizes and a culture of continuous quality improvement, creates an environment highly conducive to student success.

While the team recognizes these strengths, it also encourages DLIFLC to focus on the following areas to strengthen its practices:

- **Enhancing Equitable Practices:** The team encourages the Institution to continue prioritizing equitable practices by disaggregating student success data in ways that are meaningful to DLIFLC's mission. Additionally, ensuring that the applicable data reaches the appropriate stakeholders will support the continuous improvement of instructional practices and support services, ultimately leading to better student outcomes.

- **Reviewing Personnel Policies:** DLIFLC should continue to assess and refine local employment policies within its purview to ensure they align with institutional goals and promote an environment that effectively supports the mission.

DLIFLC's strong commitment to continuous improvement positions it well to maintain its reputation as a premier institution for military language education.  The team commends the Institution's efforts and encourages ongoing refinement of policies, practices, and support systems to enhance student success and institutional effectiveness.

# Major Findings

**Recommendations for Compliance:**
None

**Recommendations to Improve Institutional Effectiveness:**
None

**Required Documentation:**
The Institution submitted the required documentation per the Accreditation Standards.

# Standard 1

## Mission and Institutional Effectiveness

General Observations:
DLIFLC demonstrates its commitment to its students through a clear mission appropriate and specific to the college's purpose for the Department of Defense to provide, "exquisite, culturally based foreign language education, training, evaluation, and degrees" to prepare skilled linguists who will contribute significantly to national security. The Institution has integrated planning and resource allocation processes in place with stakeholder input to set short and long-term goals for Institutional improvement, innovation, and equitable student outcomes, and holds itself accountable to these goals through regular and frequent assessment of learning outcomes, program review and internal and external reporting processes. The team recognizes that DLIFLC disaggregates data to improve student success, but encourages the Institution to continue to use the analyses of the data to improve instructional practices and support services.

Findings and Evidence:
The team found that the College's mission directly relates to the Institution's purpose for the Department of Defense to provide, "exquisite, culturally based foreign language education, training, evaluation, and degrees" to prepare skilled linguists who will contribute significantly to intelligence operations and national security. The mission supports the intended student population pursuing linguistic training and degrees. The Institution demonstrates its commitment to student learning and achievement through. Further, DLIFLC effectively demonstrates its mission to provide quality instruction through small class sizes and a variety of language programs (basic, intermediate, and advanced), tailored instruction, student support, and close monitoring of student learning through assessment. The Institution names "commitment" as the key institutional value that drives its work to provide equitable outcomes for its unique, diverse student population of military personnel. (1.1)

The College uses qualitative and quantitative data to assess effectiveness in accomplishing its mission. DLIFLC establishes current goals for institutional improvement through a multi-year strategic plan and annual plan (Command Guidance), which draws on institutional data, including student learning outcomes assessment, to establish Institution set standards. Goals for institutional improvement set in the FY24 Command Guidance focus on improving graduation outcomes, with a specific focus in the Basic program to address success rates below the standard through an 80/40/10 model of goal setting for improvement. (1.2)

The team found that DLIFLC evaluates its progress and informs plans for continued improvement through program reviews, program review midpoint reports, Monthly Program Reports (MPR), the Commander's Update Brief (CUB), and the Attrition Mitigation Efforts brief. Monthly Program Reports, midcourse, and after course reviews are used to assess academic programs, including student learning outcomes assessment and the involvement of institutional

leadership in monitoring academic progress.  Program review occurs every three years with specific focus is on self-assessment of the program, identification of priorities for making improvements in "quality and stature," dialogue  (faculty, dean, and associate provost) on action items and timeline for implementation, managed by the DLIFLC Quality Assurance Office, and progress is measured via Program Review Midpoint Reports 18 months later.  The Institution has established and published standards for student achievement with FY 24 Command Guidance to address gaps in student achievement of these standards.

The Institution disaggregates programmatic-level success data in multiple ways to support its mission and equity goals.  Specifically, DLIFLC analyzes student performance by course modality—listening, reading, and speaking—to identify specific areas where students need intervention.  If a student fails in any of these modalities, they receive targeted support to address their improvement needs.  Additionally, the Institution differentiates data by the performance levels of language programs, by the distinction between junior enlisted personnel and commissioned officers—allowing for tailored onramp modules and support services—and by site location for its bachelor's degree program.  These efforts align with DLIFLC's stated equity goal to provide educational opportunities where "fair treatment, access, opportunity, and choice are visible and attainable."  The team encourages the Institution to continue prioritizing equitable practices by disaggregating student success data in ways that are meaningful to DLIFLC's mission.  Additionally, ensuring that the applicable data reaches the appropriate stakeholders will support the continuous improvement of instructional practices and support services, ultimately leading to better student outcomes. (1.3)

DLIFLC's mission is clearly posted and institutional systems for planning are designed to support this mission.   Command Guidance (under the Headquarters Department of Army G3/5/7's Annual Program Memorandum, the Combined Arms Center Command Guidance, and the Intelligence Center of Excellence's Training Guidance) is primarily responsible for organizing resource allocation and continuous quality improvement for DLIFLC.  Command Guidance is annually put together with input from fiscal, human resources, and academic leaders and includes short- and long-term institutional priorities.  National Defense Strategy (NDS) changes dictate need for changes outside of the strategic planning priorities.

Academic program planning work informs resource allocation and short- and long-term planning.  Three-year program review cycles facilitate the development in institutional priorities for program improvement and resource allocation, and the program review midpoint report functions as a way for programs to evaluate their progress towards these goals.  DLIFLC also uses external peer reviews of academic programs. (1.4)

The Institution regularly communicates progress towards its mission and goals through various means to internal and external stakeholders.  Monthly Program Reports (MPR), the Commander's Update Brief (CUB), Provost's Newsletter, program reviews, and program review midpoint reports are internal means for communicating strengths, progress, and priorities for improvement.  Through its monthly Program Report (MPR) and monthly Commander's Update

Brief (CUB), DLIFLC monitors student performance aligned to the 80/40/10 goals in the Roadmap designed to improve student success.  Updates have been made recently to the MPR briefing format to better align with institutional priorities and the current Command Guidance.  The CUB for service unit commanders focuses on Academic Progress/Concerns, Upcoming/Occurring Events, and Staff Coordination/Concern.  The Attrition Mitigation Efforts brief shares information internally biannually.  A Provost's Newsletter shares regular academic and administrative updates with DLIFLC faculty and staff. Information about the DLIFLC is communicated externally with the *Annual Program Review*. (1.5)

Conclusions:
The Institution meets Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5.

# Standard 2

## Student Success

General Observations:
DLIFLC offers a high-quality, skills-based curriculum that aligns closely with its mission.  The team found the narrative for Standard 2 is well-supported by multiple sources of evidence, demonstrating a thoughtful and thorough self-evaluation.  The Institution has robust support systems that effectively align with its program goals, particularly emphasizing the quality of instruction.  This is evident through small class sizes and a focus on hiring full-time faculty.  Additionally, students benefit from financial support to cover student fees—highlighting the Institution's strong commitment to student support.  The team was impressed with DLIFLC's academic structure, which foster collaboration among faculty to address student needs and improve lesson planning.

Findings and Evidence:
DLIFLC offers academic programs aligned with the Institution's mission and demonstrate appropriate breadth, depth, and well-defined learning outcomes.  This alignment is supported by evidence found in the Institution's Operational Environment and Opposing Force Program document and the sample syllabi reviewed by the team.  While the team recognizes the Institution fully meets the standard, the process for assessing student learning outcomes and ensuring alignment with other institutional goals could benefit from enhancement and further clarity.  Additionally, the Institution might consider strengthening the curriculum development process by adopting a more centralized approach, which would promote consistency and ensure institution-wide compliance.  It is noteworthy that the Institution is actively working on these improvements. (2.1)

DLIFLC excels in offering and delivering academic programs that adhere to both disciplinary and industry standards.  A notable strength is the Institution's integration of external peer reviews from industry experts, ensuring discipline specialists are actively involved as key stakeholders in the curriculum design and delivery.  The team found that DLIFLC places a high value on the quality of instruction, as demonstrated by its commitment to maintaining small teacher-to-student ratios.  The Institution honors the expertise of their faculty, recognizing them as curriculum specialists, while also emphasizing the importance of employing full-time faculty who are native or near-native speakers.  This approach ensures the authenticity and rigor of the curriculum—enhancing the learning experience for their students. (2.2)

The team found that the Institution has established a robust general education framework, designed to impart broad knowledge and skills to its students.  This is demonstrated by the key proficiency areas identified in the self-evaluation and evident throughout the team's meeting with stakeholders.  The mapping between competencies and curriculum pathways is impressive. (2.3)

The team found that DLIFLC excels in providing accurate and accessible information to students about its programs and services.  The team found there may be some minor opportunities to further enhance communication regarding academic programs.  For instance, individual departments could have dedicated faculty-student webpages to promote and enhance engagement.  Additionally, a periodic newsletter could serve as another effective channel for keeping students informed and connected. (2.4)

DLIFLC provides a structured course schedule that enables students to efficiently complete their language program(s).  A key feature is the automatic scheduling process, which ensures students are enrolled in the necessary courses as they progress through the program with assigned cohorts.  Additionally, DLIFLC guarantees that all basic-level students have access to required courses, regardless of the program's remaining duration. (2.5)

DLIFLC's Lesson Learned Exchange is an innovative and supportive initiative that equips faculty and staff with proven strategies to enhance learning outcomes and self-efficacy.  This collaborative program reflects strong teamwork and leadership's commitment to providing the resources necessary for continuous improvement.  Through this reflective process, faculty are empowered to regularly reassess their teaching methods and co-curricular strategies, ensuring students receive an exceptional educational experience both in- and out-of-the-classroom.  Additionally, it is worth noting that DLIFLC's Early Interventional (EI) Action Plan is an effective and holistic (i.e., psychosocial and academic) support services practice helping students take accountability for their success and demonstrating the Institution's dedication to fostering growth and achievement. (2.6)

DLIFLC has implemented several unique programs aimed at fostering a sense of belonging among new students while providing comprehensive, wrap-around services to support their educational journey, addressing both academic and psychosocial needs.  Notable initiatives include the Building Blocks Orientations I-IV for onboarding, the Degree Office which offers specialized academic advisement, and the Aiso Library, which engages in periodic strategic action plan development (currently in Phase III).   Additionally, the noncredit Introduction to Language Studies program offers supplementary academic support for students needing extra assistance to meet program standards. (2.7)

The team applauds the Institution for its Commander's Ready and Resilient Council (CR2C) initiative.  This initiative provides holistic behavioral health and spiritual resiliency sessions and programs focused on social and family support, physical fitness, and community health education.  The CR2C demonstrates a deep commitment to addressing the unique needs of DLIFLC students, contributing to their overall well-being and success. (2.7)

DLIFLC provides a wide range of opportunities to support students' social, emotional, physical, and spiritual well-being. Their Religious Support Office offers interfaith services and programs, along with spiritual and mental health counseling. The leadership has also taken meaningful steps recognize the contributions of students in observances, lectures and presentations.

Additionally, student-run senates regularly convene to discuss and address student needs. DLIFLC further promotes student engagement through community projects and engaging student activities. (2.8)

The team also found the Institution has demonstrated a comprehensive and systematic review process in previous standards, encompassing all aspects of curriculum, instruction, learning support, and student services programs. (2.9)

Conclusions:
The Institution meets the Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9.

# Standard 3

## Infrastructure and Resources

General Observations:
DLIFLC closely aligns its hiring and resource allocation processes with student enrollment.  The Institution prioritizes employing highly qualified administrative and academic personnel to support its mission, with all faculty serving as Title 10 Department of the Army civilians.  Hiring at DLIFLC follows strict federal regulations and involves multiple branches, including the Civilian Human Resources Service Center (CHRSC), the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPL), and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management (DCSRM).  The process begins with DCSRM, which determines whether enrollment levels justify additional staffing.  Job openings are advertised through USAJOBS.gov, ensuring transparency and adherence to Office of Personnel Management (OPM) guidelines.  Internal vacancies, promotions, and personnel matters are managed by DCSPL.

Through strategic enrollment management and a staffing model that forecasts needs two years in advance, DLIFLC maintains a 99% full-time faculty ratio, with adjunct faculty making up less than one percent.  These measures reinforce the institution's commitment to equitable hiring practices.  DLIFLC's hiring policies and procedures are well-documented, ensuring decisions are made within budget and through a transparent framework.  To support continuous improvement and enhance student outcomes, DLIFLC regularly reviews student academic loads and adjusts staffing accordingly.  It was noted during the visit that hiring practices in some departments may need to be reviewed to ensure the Institution is consistently hiring and onboarding faculty aligned with its established processes.

Findings and Evidence:
Policies and procedures are in place for DLIFLC to employ qualified personnel to support its mission, following federal hiring regulations and EEO practices.  The Civilian Human Resources Service Center (CHRSC), Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPL), and Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management (DCSRM) are three organizations which together manage hiring.  To determine the number of teaching and support staff positions required to execute its mission, DLIFLC uses a set staffing formula, including a set ratio of students to faculty, chairs to faculty, and deans to faculty, and each language school has a set number of noninstructional support positions.  CHRSC leads the hiring process with clear policies and procedures in the 5CFR, Delegated Examining Operations Handbook (DEOH).  Processes are in place for announcing external and internal open positions.  The military assigns active-duty members to staff and faculty positions as well.  CHRSC checks for applicants meeting minimal qualifications and ensures the process meets established federal and equal opportunity hiring practices.  DLIFLC has an EEO Office and indicated they will participate in the DoD's new roadmap for monitoring progress on DEIA goals.  The team encourages DLIFLC to continue to assess and refine local employment policies within their purview in all department and programs to ensure they align with institutional goals and promote an environment that supports the mission effectively. (3.1)

The team identified structured onboarding practices for all civilians employed at DLIFLC. New faculty must complete an 80-hour Common Faculty Development Instructor Course (CFD-IC) to learn classroom practices and effective pedagogy, followed by a mandatory three-week (120-hour) Instructor Certification Course (ICC) focused on foreign language teaching skills.  Faculty are required to be recertified every five years.  DLIFLC utilizes program review as a mechanism to identify professional learning needs.  Ongoing professional development opportunities include the Academic Senate's annual faculty conference, various technology training sessions, and workshops provided by the Faculty Support Division.  The effectiveness of these professional learning opportunities is assessed through After Action Reviews (AARs). (3.2)

DLIFLC employees are evaluated annually through processes outlined in the DoD Performance Management and Appraisal Program (DPMAP) and based on job description criteria.  Employees and supervisors develop annual performance objectives and employees who do not meet these standards begin a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). (3.3)

The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) directs resource policies and procedures.  The Institution identifies three stages for fiscal planning: program years (resource projections created at various levels internally and externally), budget development years (including assessment of all DLIFLC courses and enrollment trends), and budget execution years when funds are released by TRADOC, with a cycle of planning, programming, budgeting, and execution.  Examples given to show resource allocation to promote equitable outcomes include professional development funding, technology software, and online learning products. (3.4)

At DLIFLC, the Directorate of Resource Management (DRM) follows Army regulations and has a set annual budget planning cycle that begins in July of each year to gather budget needs to make recommendations to the Commandant (1-N list), who prioritizes financial needs.  The DRM uses the 1-N list to generate the Master Spend Plan for the year.  The Program and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) meets quarterly to adjust the budget for emerging needs.  Resource Management conducts monthly budget meetings with each directorate area to monitor the budget and make needed adjustments. (3.5)

DLIFLC falls under the Department of Army's enterprise-level audit system, per CFO Act of 1990, and notes no recent Notice of Findings/Recommendations.  The General Funds Enterprise Business System (GFEBS) is used to track financial management.  Under the Resource Management Director, the Army Risk Management and Internal Control (RMIC) Program is used for internal control systems. (3.6)

DLIFLC receives Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) funding through congressional appropriations.  At the end of each fiscal year, the Institution returns all unused funds to the U.S. Army—there are no carryover funds.  Monthly, DLIFLC receives its revenues through the Department of Army's Annual Funding Program.  DLIFLC lists three congressional appropriations, Operations and Maintenance, as the largest and goes to student learning (79%).  DLIFLC does not identify future obligations because congressional funds are only

appropriated for one fiscal year.  Federal regulations are followed for insurance needs, such as workers' compensation. (3.7)

The team learned that Installation Management Command (IMCOM) (Garrison) maintains the physical property at DLIFLC, which is a tenant of the Presidio of Monterey.  Long- term maintenance planning falls under the Garrison budget and administrative oversight with DLIFLC participation in long-term priorities.  The Institution is operating under a new Facilities Master Plan established in 2024; examples given include road paving, building upgrades, and a new dining hall construction.  The DLIFLC Space and Facilities Manager is responsible for overseeing effective academic and administrative space usage, safety priorities, and annual inspections.  Maintenance requests are tracked via the Army Maintenance App (ArMA) software, and the Building Manager Program oversees maintenance.   The Garrison oversees fire safety in the Presidio. (3.8)

The team observed policies in place from the Department of the Army Regulations (ARs), as well as the DoD and Army, for information management and information technology (IT).  At DLIFLC, Deputy Chief of Staff for Information Technology (DCSIT) Directorate is primarily responsible for technology support and the regular evaluation of technology and network infrastructure.   Command Guidance aligns technology needs with the mission, and the Educational Technology Directorate aligns technology planning with instructional needs.  DLIFLC has protocols such as multifactor identification to ensure the network remains secure.  The IT Strategic Plan includes priorities such as requests for third-party applications and software upgrades.  Working groups are formed to evaluate new technological needs, such as third-party vendors for new language software. (3.9)

DLIFLC identifies, evaluates, and mitigates potential risks by planning for financial, environmental, and technological emergencies as well as other unforeseen circumstances.  All employees receive health insurance through the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program and are potentially eligible for workers compensation from the U.S. Department of Labor, as federal employees.  Employee personnel records are securely stored by the OPM, while student records are available in read-only access format by the Academic Records Division in the Directorate of Academic Affairs.  Additional operational strategies are in place based on Army risk management plans to address natural disasters, potential terrorism, and other man-made emergencies. (3.10)

Conclusions:
The Institution meets Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10.

# Standard 4

## Governance and Decision-Making

General Observations:
The Institution demonstrates strong governance and decision-making practices that align with its mission. Policies regarding governance roles and responsibilities are well-communicated and widely distributed, ensuring transparency and inclusiveness in decision-making processes. Faculty and staff are actively involved in governance, with opportunities to participate in decisions through various committees and working groups, as well as through representative bodies like the Academic Senate and Faculty Advisory Councils. The Institution also emphasizes academic freedom and inquiry, fostering an environment that supports both faculty and student engagement.

In addition to faculty involvement, students play a key role in providing feedback on program effectiveness through regular surveys and sensing sessions, which informs decision-making at the Institution. The governance structure also includes the Commandant as the primary decision-making authority, supported by clear command guidance and the use of Army Operation Orders (OPORDs) for coordinating activities across the Institution. The Institution's decision-making processes are further strengthened by regular after-action reviews (AARs), which ensure continuous improvement and alignment with the Institution's mission. Through these efforts, the Institution upholds a comprehensive, inclusive, and well-structured approach to governance and decision-making.

Findings and Evidence:
DLIFLC demonstrates a strong commitment to the principles of academic freedom, integrity, and freedom of inquiry through its established policies, including its Academic Freedom guidelines and its publications that support scholarly exploration. Additionally, the Institution upholds these values through its Academic Code of Conduct. (4.1)

DLIFLC utilizes a collaborative decision-making structure that actively engages all stakeholders. Through meetings with the Board of Advisors (BoV), administration, faculty, staff, and students, the team found that the Institution fosters an inclusive decision-making environment where all constituents have a voice. The Institution demonstrates a clear commitment to gathering feedback and using it to refine practices, enhance programmatic instructional models, improve operational processes, and strengthen institutional structures in alignment with its mission. The team recognizes DLIFLC for its clearly defined decision-making structures and the comprehensive evidence provided, which illustrate a well-organized and effective approach to governance, continuous improvement, and responsiveness to stakeholder input. (4.2)

The team found that DLIFLC has established a robust decision-making process with well-observed practices as part of the team visit. While the Institution referenced conducting a review of its decision-making process in 2023, establishing a more formalized and recurring

evaluation could enhance the effectiveness and consistency of decision-making moving forward. Overall, the team appreciated the role of the BoV and the integrated decision-process at all levels within the Institution. (4.3)

The DLIFLC BoV operates as an advisory body under the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC). The BoV does not make policy but follows formal operating procedures akin to bylaws, approved by the AEAC, to provide guidance and recommendations on the Institution's mission and academic quality. The BoV regularly reviews student learning outcomes, fiscal health, and strategic planning efforts, offering feedback for continuous improvement. The BoV advises the Commandant on these areas, supporting institutional integrity and mission fulfillment. (4.4)

DLIFLC has a structured leadership selection process for its Commandant, who serves as the chief executive officer (CEO) of the Institution. The Commandant is appointed by the Centrally Appointed Senior Board of Officers, a process that is vetted by the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, ensuring the unique mission and operational needs of the military Institution are considered. While the BoV does not have the authority to select or formally evaluate the Commandant, it provides feedback and advisory input on leadership matters during established meetings, allowing the BoV to fulfill its supportive role in promoting effective operations and the fulfillment of DLIFLC's mission. (4.5)

DLIFLC ensures the BoV operates effectively as a collective entity committed to promoting the Institution's values and mission while fulfilling its fiduciary responsibilities. The BoV's Operating Procedures mandate that members provide observations and recommendations essential for the successful accomplishment of DLIFLC's public mission to enhance national security. With diverse backgrounds in government, industry, and education, BoV members engage in constructive dialogue during meetings, ensuring a range of perspectives on critical issues. This collaborative approach is reflected in the meeting minutes and validated through meetings with the BoV while onsite during the visit. Following each meeting, the BoV conducts a self-evaluation to enhance future effectiveness, demonstrating adherence to best practices in governance. Furthermore, the Staff Judge Advocate ensures that members undergo ethics training and conflict of interest reviews, reinforcing the board's commitment to ethical governance. (4.6)

Conclusions:
The Institution meets Standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6.

# Verification of Required Documentation

The evaluation items detailed in this Checklist are those which fall specifically under federal regulations and related Commission policies, beyond what is articulated in the Accreditation Standards. Some required documentation may have been used in response to ACCJC Standards that address the same or similar subject matter. For each required item listed, the team must verify its review of the required documentation, and indicated its conclusion by choosing one of the options below and note any comment or concerns where needed:

| Verified | The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the Institution to meet the Commission's requirements. |
| --- | --- |
| Verified, with Recommendations for improvement | The team has reviewed the elements of this component and has found the Institution to meet the Commission's requirements, but improvement is recommended. |
| Not met | The team has reviewed the elements of this component and found the Institution does not meet the Commission's requirements. |

## Standard 1: Mission and Institutional Effectiveness

| Required Item | Conclusions |
| --- | --- |
| i   Documentation of institution's authority to operate as a post-secondary educational institution and award degrees (e.g., degree-granting approval statement, authorization to operate, articles of incorporation) (ER 1) | __X_ Verified<br>____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| ii.  Procedures/practices for periodic review of mission/mission-related statements, including provisions for revision (if/when revisions are needed) that allow for participation of institutional stakeholders, as appropriate for the character and context of the institution | __X_ Verified<br>____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| iii. Documentation of the governing board's approval of the institutional mission (ER 6) | __X_ Verified<br>____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| iv.  Procedures/practices for setting institutional goals, including provisions for the inclusion of input from relevant institutional stakeholders, as appropriate for the character and context of the institution | __X_ Verified<br>____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |

| Required Item | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| v. Documentation that the institution has established standards and goals for student achievement (i.e., institution-set standards), including but not limited to standards and goals for course success, degree and certificate attainment, transfer, job placement rates, and licensure examination pass rates, at the institutional and program levels (ER 2, ER 11) | \_\_X\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |

## Standard 2: Student Success

| Required Item | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| i. Documentation that the institution's practices for awarding credit reflect generally accepted norms in higher education, including:<br>• Commonly accepted minimum program lengths for certificates, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees<br>• Written policies for determining credit hours that are consistently applied to all courses, programs, and modalities<br>• Adherence to the Department of Education's standards for clock-to-credit hour conversions, if applicable (ER 10)<br><br>(See Commission *Policy on Credit Hour, Clock Hour, and Academic Year*) | \_\_\_X\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| ii. Documentation that the institution's transfer of credit policies includes the following:<br>• Any established criteria the institution uses regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution<br>• Any types of institutions or sources from which the institution will not accept credits<br>• A list of institutions with which the institution has established an articulation agreement<br>• Written criteria used to evaluate and award credit for prior learning experience including, but not limited to, service in the armed forces, paid or unpaid employment, or other demonstrated competency or learning<br><br>See *Policy on Transfer of Credit* | \_\_X\_\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| iii. Documentation of the institution's advertising and recruitment policies, demonstrating alignment with the *Policy on Institutional Advertising and Student Recruitment* (ER 16) | \_\_X\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |

| Required Item | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| iv. Documentation of clear policies and procedures for handling student complaints, including:<br>• Evidence that these policies/procedures are accessible to students in the catalog and online;<br>• Evidence that that institution provides contact information for filing complaints with associations, agencies and governmental bodies that accredit, approve, or license the institution and any of its programs | \_\_X\_\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| v. Verification that the institution maintains files of formal student complaints received throughout the current accreditation cycle (i.e., since the last site visit), demonstrating:<br>• Accurate and consistent implementation of complaint policies and procedures<br>• No issues indicative of noncompliance with Standards | \_\_X\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| vi. Verification that student records are stored permanently, securely, and confidentially, with provision for secure backup | \_\_X\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| vii. Documentation of the institution's policies and/or practices for the release of student records | \_\_X\_\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| viii. Documentation that the institution's policies and procedures for program discontinuance provide enrolled students with opportunities for timely completion in the event of program elimination | \_\_X\_\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| ix. Official college catalog contains required elements (ER 20) | \_\_X\_\_Verified<br>\_\_\_\_Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>\_\_\_\_Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |

| Required Item | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| **FOR TITLE IV PARTICIPANTS:** | |
| x. Documentation of institution's implementation of the required components of the Title IV Program, including:<br>• Findings from any audits and program/other review activities by the U.S. Department of Education (ED)<br>• Evidence of timely corrective action taken in response to any Title IV audits or program reviews<br><br>See *Policy on Institutional Compliance with Title IV* | N/A - Institution is not a Title IV Program<br><br>____Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**: |
| **FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH DISTANCE EDUCATION AND/OR CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION:** | |
| xi. Documentation of institution's :<br>• Procedures for verifying that the student who registers in a course offered via distance education or correspondence education is the same person who participates in the course and receives academic credit<br>• Policies and/or procedures for notifying students of any charges associated with verification of student identity (if applicable)<br>• Policies regarding protection of student privacy<br><br>See *Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education* | N/A -- Institution does not have a Distance Education or Correspondence Education Program<br><br>____Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| **REQUIRED ONLY IF APPLICABLE** | |
| xii. Documentation demonstrating how the institution distinguishes its pre-collegiate curriculum from its college-level curriculum | N/A - The institution does not offer pre-collegiate curriculum<br><br>____Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |

| Required Item | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| xiii. Documentation of policies and/or procedures for awarding credit for prior learning and/or competency-based credit | N/A - This does not apply to DLIFLC<br><br>____Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| xiv. Documentation of agreements with other external parties regarding the provision of student and/or learning support services | N/A - This does not apply to DLIFLC<br><br>____Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| xv. Policies and/or other documentation related to institutional expectations of conformity with any specific worldviews or beliefs | N/A - This does not apply to DLIFLC<br><br>____Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |

## Standard 3: Infrastructure and Resources

| Checklist Item | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| i. Written policies and procedures for human resources, including hiring procedures | __X_Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| ii. Employee handbooks or similar documents that communicate expectations to employees | __X_Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| iii. Annual financial audit reports - 3 prior years (include auxiliary organizations, if applicable) (ER 5) | __X_Verified<br>____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |

| | |
|---|---|
| iv. Practices for resource allocation and budget development (including budget allocation model for multi-college districts/systems) | __X_ Verified<br>_____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| v. Policies guiding fiscal management (e.g., related to reserves, budget development) | __X__ Verified<br>_____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>None |
| vi. Policies, procedures or agreements (e.g., AUAs) related to appropriate use of technology systems | __X_ Verified<br>_____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| **FOR TITLE IV PARTICIPANTS:** | |
| vii. Documentation that the institution's student loan default rates are within the acceptable range defined by ED, or – if rates fall outside the acceptable range - documentation of corrective efforts underway to address the issue | N/A - Institution is not a Title IV Program<br><br>_____Verified<br>_____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| **REQUIRED ONLY IF APPLICABLE** | |
| viii. Documentation of any agreements that fall under ACCJC's policy on contractual relationships with non-accredited organizations | N/A -- Does not apply to DLIFLC<br><br>_____Verified<br>_____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| ix. Written code of professional ethics for all personnel including consequences for violations | __X__ Verified<br>_____Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |

## Standard 4: Governance and Decision-Making

| Checklist Item | Documentation |
|---|---|
| i. Governing board policies/procedures for selecting and regularly evaluating its chief executive officer | __X__ Verified<br>_____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| ii. Documentation or certification that the institution's CEO does not serve as the chair of the governing board (ER 4) | __X_ Verified<br>_____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| iii. Governing board policies/procedures/bylaws related to Board Ethics | __X_ Verified<br>_____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| iv. Governing board policies/procedures/bylaws related to conflict of interest | __X_ Verified<br>_____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |

## Other Federal Regulations and Related Commission Policies

| Checklist Item | Conclusions |
|---|---|
| i. Documentation of the institution's appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comment in advance of the Focused Site Visit and – if applicable - cooperate with the review team in any necessary follow-up<br><br>See *Policy on Rights, Responsibilities, and Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions*, Section D | __X__ Verified<br>_____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |
| ii. Documentation that the institution provides accurate information for the public concerning its accredited status with ACCJC on its institutional website, no more than one page (one click) away from the home page<br><br>See *Policy on Representation of Accredited Status* | __X__ Verified<br>_____ Verified, with Recommendation(s) for improvement<br>_____ Not met<br><br>**Recommendation(s) for improvement**:<br>N/A |