

7 and 8 December 2016 Board of Visitors
Meeting of the
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Monterey, California

7 – 8 December 2016 Contents

TAB A-	Administrative Details
TAB B-	Meeting Agenda
TAB C-	Minutes
TAB D-	Subcommittee Members/Mission/Meeting Purpose
TAB E-	Observers and Guests
TAB F-	Handouts
TAB G-	Actions Forwarded to the AEA

TAB A - Administrative Details FEDERAL REGISTER ANNOUNCEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Army Education Advisory Subcommittee Meeting Notice

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of open Subcommittee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Army is publishing this notice to announce the following Federal advisory committee meeting of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Board of Visitors, a subcommittee of the Army Education Advisory Committee. This meeting is open to the public.

DATES: The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) Board of Visitors Subcommittee will meet from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on December 7 and from 09:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on December 8, 2016.

ADDRESS: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, 891 Elkridge Road, Linthicum Heights, MD, 21090.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Detlev Kesten, the Alternate Designated Federal Officer for the subcommittee, in writing at Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, ATFL-APAS-AA, Bldg. 634, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944, by e-mail at detlev.kestev@dliflc.edu, or by telephone at (831) 242-6670.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The subcommittee meeting is being held under the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (5 U.S.C., Appendix, as amended), the Government in the Sunshine Act of 1976 (5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended), and 41 CFR 102-3.150.

Purpose of the Meeting: The purpose of the meeting is to provide the subcommittee with briefings and information focusing on the Institute's plan to implement a comprehensive leadership development plan for its faculty and staff and to present updates to the curriculum. The subcommittee will also receive an update on the Institute's accreditation and will address administrative matters.

Proposed Agenda: December 7—The subcommittee will receive briefings associated with DLIFLC's leadership development goals and curriculum updates and the Institute's actions in supporting said goal. The subcommittee will be updated on the Institute's on going self-study to reaffirm its academic accreditation. The subcommittee will complete administrative procedures and appointment requirements. December 8—The subcommittee will have time to discuss and compile observations pertaining to agenda items. General deliberations leading to provisional findings will be referred to the Army Education Advisory Committee for deliberation by the Committee under the open-

meeting rules.

Public Accessibility to the Meeting: Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b, as amended, and 41 CFR 102–3.140 through 102–3.165, and subject to the availability of space, this meeting is open to the public. Seating is on a first to arrive basis. Attendees are requested to submit their name, affiliation, and daytime phone number NLT fourteen business days prior to the meeting to Mr. Kesten, via electronic mail, the preferred mode of submission, at the address listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section. Members of the public attending the subcommittee meetings will not be permitted to present questions from the floor or speak to any issue under consideration by the subcommittee. Because the meeting of the subcommittee will be held in a Federal Government facility, security screening is required. A photo ID is required to enter the facility. Please note that security and gate guards have the right to inspect vehicles and persons seeking to enter and exit the installation. The facility is fully handicap accessible. Wheelchair access is available at the main entrance of the building. For additional information about public access procedures, contact Mr. Kesten, the subcommittee’s Alternate Designated Federal Officer, at the email address or telephone number listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section.

Written Comments or Statements: Pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.105(j) and 102-3.140 and section 10(a)(3) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the public or interested organizations may submit written comments or statements to the subcommittee, in response to the stated agenda of the open meeting or in regard to the subcommittee’s mission in general. Written comments or statements should be submitted to Mr. Kesten, the subcommittee Alternate Designated Federal Officer, via electronic mail, the preferred mode of submission, at the address listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section. Each page of the comment or statement must include the author's name, title or affiliation, address, and daytime phone number. The Alternate Designated Federal Official will review all submitted written comments or statements and provide them to members of the subcommittee for their consideration. Written comments or statements being submitted in response to the agenda set forth in this notice must be received by the Alternate Designated Federal Official at least seven business days prior to the meeting to be considered by the subcommittee. Written comments or statements received after this date may not be provided to the subcommittee until its next meeting.

Pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.140d, the Committee is not obligated to allow a member of the public to speak or otherwise address the Committee during the meeting. Members of the public will be permitted to make verbal comments during the Committee meeting only at the time and in the manner described below. If a member of the public is interested in making a verbal comment at the open meeting, that individual must submit a request, with a brief statement of the subject matter to be addressed by the comment, at least seven business days in advance to the subcommittee’s Alternate Designated Federal Official, via electronic mail, the preferred mode of submission, at the address listed in the “FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT” section. The Alternate Designated Federal Official will log each request, in the order received, and in consultation with the Subcommittee Chair, determine whether the subject matter of each comment is relevant to the Subcommittee’s mission and/or the topics to be addressed in this public meeting.

A 15-minute period near the end of the meeting will be available for verbal public comments. Members of the public who have requested to make a verbal comment and whose comments have been deemed relevant under the process described above, will be allotted no more than three minutes during the period, and will be invited to speak in the order in which their requests were received by the Alternate Designated Federal Official.

Brenda S. Bowen, Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.
[FR Doc. [2016-25620](#) Filed 10-21-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001-03-P

TAB B - Meeting Agenda

**Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Board of Visitors (BoV) Meeting
7 – 8 December 2016**

Wednesday, 7 Dec 2016

- 7:30 am Leave TDY hotel for BoV meeting location
- Received by: Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 7:55 am Arrive at BoV meeting location
- Park in Reserved Visitor Parking Spaces
- Received by Beth Mackey, Dean, College of Language and Area Studies National Cryptologic School, and
- Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, DLIFLC Provost
- 8:00 am – 8:15 am Welcome Remarks, BoV meeting location
- COL Phillip J. Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant
- Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost, DLIFLC
- Ms Beth Mackey
- Attendees at (1) Below
- 8:15 am – 8:30 am Call to Order
- Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair
- BoV FACA Compliance, Administrative Business, Review of BoV by-laws
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 8:30 am – 9:30 am Host presentation
BoV meeting location conference room
- Ms Beth Mackey, Dean, College of Language and Area Studies National Cryptologic School
- 9:30 am – 9:45 am Break
- 9:45 am – 10:30 am Introduction of Topic: Leadership Development at DLIFLC
BoV meeting location conference room
1. Introduction by COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant
2. Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
3. Dr. Natalie Fryberger, Director, Leadership Development Office (LDO)
4. Dr. Hiam Kanbar, Associate Provost, UGE
- 10:30 am – 11:15 am Leadership Development Efforts at DLIFLC
BoV meeting location conference room
- Dr. Natalie Fryberger, Director, LDO

- 11:15 am – 11:45 am Accreditation Updates/Ethics Training
BoV meeting location conference room
- Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 11:45 pm – 1:00 pm BoV Working Lunch
BoV meeting location conference room
- 1:00 pm – 1:45 pm Leadership opportunities and challenges at ILC
- Ms. Bella Kelly, LTD Academic Site Director
- 1:45 pm – 2:30 pm Leadership opportunities and challenges at UML
BoV meeting location conference room
- Dr. Hyeyeon Lim, Dean, UML
- 2:30 pm – 3:15 pm Leadership opportunities and challenges at UPF
BoV meeting location conference room
- Dr. Mica Hall, Dean, UPF
- 3:15 pm – 3:30 pm Break
- 3:30 pm – 4:30 pm Introduction to Open Architecture
- Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
- 4:30 pm Adjournment

Thursday, 8 Dec 2016

- 9:30 am Arrive at BoV meeting location conference room
- Received by Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
- 9:35 am Call to Order
BoV meeting location conference room
- Dr. Richard Brecht, BoV Chair
- 9:35 am – 10:15 am Commandant's Priorities
- COL Phillip J. Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant
- 10:15 am – 10:30 am Break & Official BoV picture
BoV meeting location conference room
- 10:30 am – 11:30 am Commandant's Priorities (cont.)
- 11:30 am – 11:45 am Break
- 11:45 pm – 12:30 pm BoV working lunch (start outbrief compilation)

	BoV meeting location conference room
12:30 pm – 2:00 pm	BoV time to compile Outbrief, cont. BoV meeting location conference room
2:00 pm – 2:30 pm	BoV Outbrief to DLIFLC Commandant and Provost BoV meeting location conference room
2:30 pm – 2:45 pm	Break
2:45 pm – 3:00 pm	BoV Administration: Meeting Evaluation, Scheduling BoV meeting location conference room - Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO
3:00 pm – 3:15 pm	BoV Outbrief to DLI Leadership, Staff & Faculty BoV meeting location conference room - Attendees at (1) below
3:15 pm – 3:30 pm	Closing Remarks by COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
3:30 pm	Adjournment

(1) Attendees

Mr. Scott Allen, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
Amb. Ruth A. Davis, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. James Keagle, Col, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, Lt Gen, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors
COL Phillip J. Deppert, Commandant, DLIFLC
MS Beth Mackey, Dean, College of Language and Area Studies National Cryptologic School
Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost
Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support & ADFO
Dr. Hiam Kanbar, Associate Provost, UGE
Mr. Rick Monreal, Associate Provost, Continuing Education
Dr. Parandeh Kia, Assistant Provost, UGE
Mr. Hassane Bouhaja, Dean, CE
Dr. Natalie Fryberger, Director, Center for Leadership Development (CLD)
Dr. Hyekyung Sung-Frear, Dean, UEL
Dr. Deanna Tovar, Dean, UMB
Dr. Marina Cobb, Dean, UAB
Dr. Jeanette Edwards, Dean, UAA
Dr. Shen-Sheng Zhu, Dean, UMA
Dr. Hye-Yeon Lim, Dean, UCL
Dr. Viktoriya Shevchenko, Dean, UMC
Dr. Mica Hall, Dean, UPF

TAB C - Minutes

**Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Board of Visitors (BoV) Meeting
Meeting Minutes**

Meeting Dates: December 7 and December 8, 2016

Place: International Learning Center (ILC), Linthicum Heights, MD

Board of Visitors Members Present:

Mr. Scott Allen, Member, Board of Visitors

Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors

Amb. Ruth A. Davis, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors

Dr. James Keagle, COL, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors

Dr. Ervin Rokke, LTG, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors

Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors

Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors

Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors

BoV Alternate Designated Federal Officer:

Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support

December 7, 2016

Welcome Remarks

COL Phillip J. Deppert, DLIFLC Commandant, welcomed all in attendance and thanked the ILC personnel and others for hosting the BoV.

Call to Order

Dr. Richard Brecht, DLIFLC Board of Visitors chairperson, called the meeting to order at 0837. He welcomed all in attendance, and provided a brief explanation of the BoV's purpose for first-time attendees.

BoV FACA Compliance, Administrative Business

Mr. Kesten called attention to the copy of the by-laws (board's operating procedure) that he provided to each board member, asking them to review the by-laws, and inform him of proposed changes if any. Mr. Kesten informed that there are currently eight board members (with a maximum of 12).

Mr. Kesten then asked the board members to review the copy of their latest CVs to ensure that they are current and he can resubmit them to Mr. Joyner at the AEAC. Mr. Kesten also asked that members complete the "self-evaluation" they were given to evaluate their understanding of the BoV process to identify trends or areas that need to be addressed. He informed the board that in March of 2018, the ACCJC Accreditation Commission will be at DLIFLC for a five-day evaluation and that the Board consider meeting during the Commission's visit to allow for the interaction with the Commission members.

National Cryptologic School Briefing

Ms. Beth Mackey, Dean, College of Language and Area Studies welcomed the attendees, and provided a brief overview of the structure at the National Cryptologic School (NCS) and explained that the school's primary focus over the last few years has been cyber-related. She then talked about the efforts that would enable students to achieve higher levels of proficiency by discussing three areas: People, Integration and innovation, and Autonomous learning.

People: Ms. Mackey reported that the NCS delivered over 1 million hours of language training per year to a student population of more than 90% military who began their careers at DLIFLC. Consequently, DLIFLC's mission success is critical.

Ms. Mackey explained that the NCS is the Responsible Training Authority (RTA) for Cryptologic Language Analysts at the intermediate and advanced levels, but occasionally conducts basic level classes for civilians who are cross-training from one language into a new one.

Ms. Mackey stated the agency's new Senior Language Authority and her initiative to focus less on the DLPT, and the inclusion of higher-level assessments coupled with deeper cultural knowledge are the efforts to facilitate language analysts to achieve the levels "beyond" 3/3. Another area of focus was the development of a greater understanding of the skills needed to become an effective Cryptologic Language Analyst. Ms. Mackey cited a model called the "10 Dimensions of Language Analysis" and explained how she will use the research findings for developing a strategy to achieve these goals. She also stressed that training at the NCS is "requirement driven," meaning that instruction is based on the requirements of the customer. An example is the partnership with the College of Cyber and the efforts to determine what kind of language training requirements Cyber Command will have.

Ms. Mackey specified that the key consideration is whether these students are matched with the languages in which they would best succeed. COL Deppert reported that the services are working hard to develop the processes for identifying, screening and enlisting individuals who have previous language experience.

Integration and Innovation: Ms. Mackey pressed on with her briefing discussing the integration and innovation focus of NCS. She cited the partnership with DLI and stated that the successful efforts at the Westgate Learning Center in Georgia to help NCS build a mobile environment would not have been possible without DLI; these have been invaluable in similar efforts in Hawaii, Texas and in Maryland. A major challenge with the implementation of these new technologies is training the faculty and the students to use them to optimize the available capabilities and resources. The implementation of .edu email address is another important change to allow for separation between the unclassified training world and the classified world.

She went on to say that, another benefit of our partnership with DLI has been the

opportunity for some NCS faculty to participate in the Advanced Language Academy (ALA) which focuses on preparing instructors to teach to the goal of achieving the higher proficiency levels. NCS will be working with DLI to set up the same training for all of their faculty as well. Ms. Mackey reemphasized that since the cryptologic pipeline begins at DLI with its graduates coming to NCS centers, it is important that we continue to work together to ensure that the transition is as smooth as possible. The concept of “open architecture” is something that NCS has been looking at as well and it will be important that they continue to work closely with DLI.

Autonomous learning: Ms. Mackey presented efforts and challenges in creating autonomous learners and cited that a major obstacle in developing autonomous learners stems from an environment that encourages students to take a class once per year and then usually just before they are scheduled to take the DLPT. Students should be receiving training that will help improve their proficiency as well as their job performance. She also presented the Joint Language University (JLU) as another NCS-funded resource that offers Language Analysts a diverse repository for language training materials and programs. Dr. Leaver mentioned that there are cohorts in MD and in GA that have been working on methods for helping students achieve proficiency levels beyond 3/3.

Break

INTRODUCTION OF TOPIC: LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

COL Deppert reminded the group of discussions held at the previous BoV meeting in which a need to develop a “bench” of talent for the future at DLI was identified. This need was identified when several individuals in critical positions left DLI to pursue other opportunities, and back filling these positions with qualified personnel proved difficult. He emphasized that the topic of leadership is very important at DLI and as a result of these revelations, he tasked Dr. Natalie Fryberger with developing a faculty career pathway that would provide new hires with specific training and certifications that would allow them to take on greater leadership roles within DLI.

Status of Leadership Development at DLIFLC

Dr. Natalie Fryberger, Director, Leadership Development Office (LDO), presented the information on how the ideas for the Center of Leadership Development evolved and merged at DLI, what has been done thus far, and what the future holds.

The DLI leadership program team met with and explored many government and non-government agencies with a possibility of collaborating with them for the leadership program. The team faced obstacles such as contracting, other agencies’ lack of resources, membership issues due to different personnel systems etc. as they pertain to leadership program training.

The needs of DLI are unique and complex, due in part to its mission of teaching foreign languages while accommodating a diverse faculty of multinational instructors. A Senior Leadership Summit was conducted to discuss and determine what “good leadership” looks like and then implementing a plan for developing that fosters such leadership environment. A theme of the summit was “Shared Governance,” with the understanding that good

leadership and shared governance go hand in hand. Prior to the summit, a survey on Leadership Principles and Competencies was sent to all of DLI, resulting in 300-respondents. The survey provided both quantitative and qualitative data.

Summit participants reviewed the results of the survey and participated in various activities designed to identify values and behaviors associated with strong and effective leadership. 12 leadership principles were agreed upon, along with 10 leadership competencies for 3rd Line Supervisors. COL Deppert offered up the one phrase to sum up the 12 leadership principles: “The institutional culture that enables all of us to realize a larger purpose than ourselves.”

Dr. Fryberger continued her report on the summit, noting that the participants included members from the MLI staff, Associate Deans, Deans and those higher up. At the completion of these efforts, COL Deppert concluded and announced that there was a need to open an Office of Leadership Development at DLIFLC.

Dr. Fryberger then provided graphics that illustrated examples of key values, noting that integrity and honesty were two upon which all agreed. COL Deppert reminded the group that DLIFLC is an organization of 1800 personnel from 93 countries and lauded the efforts of leadership to define the organizational principles, defining how they apply to each school and how to make them work for everyone. Both COL Deppert and Dr. Fryberger emphasized that these principles are still being refined and that this is a work in progress. Dr. Fryberger added that the term “shared governance” also includes statements about collaboration, shared decision making and involving others, so it is not just a structure but also a process by which they can conduct meetings that allow everyone to have a voice and ownership in the process.

Dr. Fryberger stated the importance of remaining flexible and having adaptability moving forward. Dr. Fryberger added that another focus of the summit was examining each level of supervision so as to incorporate critical principles and competencies to develop parameters for designing training that fits specific needs at each level.

Dr. Fryberger updated the group on the current status of the Center for Leadership Development. To date, there is a Director and Tiger Team of 11 senior leaders from all of the representational groups. Weekly meetings are held to work on conceptual and logistical issues. The Tiger Team has identified a mission and vision for DLIFLC. The vision of the Center is “Impact to foster an innovative culture of leadership and followership.” Followership was included because it is imperative that not only the leaders, but followers as well, are actively engaged in the process to ensure its success. In the past, faculty have shied away from stepping up to fill positions of greater responsibility, or those that wanted to step up didn’t know how, and that is the focus of this initiative. Dr. Fryberger continued with her presentation discussing her tasks as the Director. An important early task is the creation of leadership development training paths for each level and defining what to include at each level in the path. She provided an example: at the instructor level, group dynamics and the stages of group development need to be covered.

At the Team Leader level, the focus might be more about the components of leading a

group without supervisory authority and relational behaviors and their impact on a group dynamic. At the Supervisory level, the focus would be more on learning management skills and integrating leadership. At the Dean's level, the focus might be on how to lead through the efforts of other people and how to lead an organization. The last level is the Executive Leadership level. Conflict Resolution is another example and determining how to address it at each of the different levels. Dr. Fryberger stated that the idea of "group think" should be integrated at the lowest level to allow these people to express their ideas.

Accreditation Updates

Mr. Detlev Kesten informed the group that DLI is currently undergoing an academic reaccreditation process conducted by the ACCJC, the West Coast and Pacific accreditation board for Junior Colleges, of which DLI is a part. At the last meeting, Dr. Steven Payne, DLIFLC's Historian and Accreditation Liaison Officer, provided an overview of the accreditation process. Since that meeting until now, DLI is currently "in the weeds" with committees and groups working on the four different areas of accreditation, and Dr. Payne has POCs for each area who in turn manage teams that provide updates. The first step in the process is gathering evidence that indicates if any updates are required. One major change since the last accreditation in 2012 is a requirement for all evidence to be in an electronic format and stored in a repository. A Share Point site has been created to satisfy this requirement. Another mandate from the committee is that hyperlinks be included in the text to allow them to view associated information. Mr. Kesten presented a graphic identifying the four areas and the status of each process.

COL Deppert emphasized the importance of accreditation and cited the numerous efforts across the military services to provide accredited training to service members. Ms. Mackey agreed and provided several specific examples, adding that the NCS is also very interested in accreditation for their courses. Mr. Kesten added that at the orientation meeting conducted by the ACCJC last spring, the 2012 DLIFLC report was cited as the example of what institutions seeking accreditation should be doing. BoV members asked about their roles in the effort. Mr. Kesten reported that Dr. Payne will continue to provide updates and will then send out a draft of the final product to each board member for review and input. Then in late October of 2017, a copy will be submitted to the ACCJC for their examination and members will be cc'd at that time. The final step would be to conduct the March 2018 BoV meeting simultaneously to allow for interaction between the two bodies.

Ethics Training

BoV members completed the mandatory ethics training online.

BoV Working Lunch Break

Dr. Brecht solicited feedback from the BoV members on topic areas covered in the day's briefings for potential recommendations. The BoV then had an unformatted discussion with DLIFLC Commandant, Assistant Commandant and Provost.

Leadership Opportunities at the ILC

Ms. Bella Kelly, LTD Academic Site Director presented graphics showing locations of the Extension Programs supported by DLIFLC Language Training Detachments (LTD). For the ILC, she reported that the student population was a combination of military and

civilians. ILC courses consist of Conversion, Enhancement, Intermediate, Advanced, Skill/Topic-Based and Directed Studies and are completely “requirement driven,” meaning that they develop and teach courses based completely on student need. One important point is that due to the lack of curriculum, academic, or technology specialists, ILC instructors must possess not only strong teaching skills but also must be able to develop their own materials and integrate technology into their instruction. Ms. Kelly continued on addressing the plan for dealing with the challenges ahead. The Post-Basic Instructors Certification Program which equips instructors with the skills to develop these higher-level courses is one important program that the ILC will be using. Also, the Faculty Development Support Division will be instrumental in providing training to faculty although they are stretched and scheduling these training courses is sometimes difficult. The Advanced Language Academy will be in place in the future as well, so faculty will have the opportunity to participate there. Additionally, the ILC utilizes a mentoring program pairing our stronger, more senior instructors, with the newer instructors. The ILC has established a Teacher Exchange Program that allows instructors to visit other LTDs to bring back “best practices” and vice versa.

Ms. Kelly continued citing Content Based Instruction that Dr. Leaver inspired them to use as one approach to teach at higher levels as well. Many societal aspects and historical perspectives are taught in these courses in the target language. Another method used is the Learner Preparedness Program, starting pre-class in collaboration with the units and at the ILC. These consist of weekly English reading assignments in which students complete the reading and then post their reflections on what they’ve read. Another challenge is in the area of Diagnostic Assessments and the continued efforts to develop accurate assessments to ensure that students are placed in the correct level courses, as the DLPT is not always an accurate measurement. Currently, students complete a diagnostic assessment on the first day of class to allow the instructors to tailor the courses to the student’s needs. There is also an effort to develop an “open architecture” environment in order to develop autonomous learners.

Ms. Mackey cited CL-150, an NCS funded, online program that pushes out a lessons weekly for students to complete beyond the formal courses. Across the board, efforts continue to change the mindset of students from training to maintain DLPT scores to instead developing and implementing a study plan that will allow them to improve their overall proficiency and job-related skills.

COL Deppert interjected that one factor that has not been considered in these discussions are the stressors that every one of the instructors and faculty are dealing with. DLI has implemented an Employee Wellness Program that encourages and allows employees to have time during their workdays to get out and exercise and the results have been tremendous. He encouraged the LTDs to implement this type of plan.

Leadership Opportunities and Challenges at UML

Dr. Hye-Yeon Lim, Dean of UML introduced herself and informed the group that she would be discussing the challenges brought about by downsizing. Dr. Lim, who has been the Dean at UML for the last 3.5 years, reported that when she started, the school taught several language groups to include Pashtu, Urdu, Dari, Hindi, Indonesian, and Turkish.

However, in the last two years, due to diminishing service requirements, the Dari, Turkish and Hindi programs have all transferred to DLI Washington and the Pashtu program is currently downsizing. In the 3.5 years that she has been the Dean, faculty numbers have dropped from 200 to 150. Dr. Lim presented 3 specific areas of challenge that this downsizing has created:

- **Faculty morale** – Uncertain job security has created a good deal of negative emotion, which is contagious. Faculty ask “why me” when they are informed that their positions are no longer needed. The biggest issue is failure to understand that their positions are filled on a “Not to Exceed” (NTE) status, which means that these positions exist on a basis of demand and will be eliminated if such demand drops. Unless they are tenured, these instructors are susceptible to the elimination of their positions. COL Deppert explained that the impact manifests in the form of rumors and misconceptions spreading throughout the faculty and emphasized the need for the leadership to stay out in front of such misinformation. Dr Lim shared the new business rule developed by HQ that was made public and explains the criteria and guidelines for how downsizing is accomplished. Also, Town Hall meetings have been an effective means of informing everyone about what was happening and the process involved. Good communication has proven to be the key to ensuring that everyone is aware of what is happening and allowed them to ask questions and express their concerns.

Dr Lim continued emphasizing the importance of taking care of personnel being released, as well as those who remain. For these faculty members, it is important to encourage them and show them appreciation for their good work. Dr Kanbar reported that in UGE Schools, they are encouraging their faculty to OPI in every language that they are proficient in to open up other opportunities if and when they might be affected by downsizing.

- **Student Concerns** – Dr. Lim expressed that downsizing affects the students as well. Any change in the program may affect them and their careers in the future. Communication is important here as well and MLIs play an important role in keeping the students focused on the mission. Strong well-established curriculum is also helpful in that it can be taught by any of the teachers.
- **Management Challenges** – The rapidity of decline has been a major issue, so there hasn’t always been enough time to take steps to prepare faculty for their release and lessen the impact of downsizing. Dr. Leaver added that in the past, faculty might be given just seven days’ notice, which was egregious and are now given 30 days which better prepares them to come to terms with the situation and plan for the future. Also, they have time with the leadership to voice their concerns and feel they were treated well. COL Deppert stated that it is not lost on leadership that these are human beings and they make every effort to ease the transitions. Dr. Leaver added that while they would love to be able to keep faculty updated and notified in advance of upcoming completions of NTEs and downsizing but unfortunately, more often than not, the leadership themselves do not have much notice. Despite the quarterly requirement reviews, these changes can come out of nowhere so this is a challenge.

Leadership Opportunities and Challenges at UPF

Dr. Mica Hall, Dean, UPF, presented an overview of the Persian Farsi School. They have six departments with 160 faculty and staff. Like the other UGE Schools, they are a Basic Acquisition program and focus not only on getting students from 0 to 2+ but also helping them become lifelong learners. She emphasized that in order to get students to the 2+ and 3 levels, it is important to build a strong foundation and to teach good work skills. Dr. Hall provided examples of some of the challenges they have encountered:

- Low levels of trust both vertically and horizontally, leading to minimal collaboration primarily on the lateral level. In order to build trust, making the effort to talk to individuals has proven to be very effective, while empowering them and recognizing the good work they do.
- Another challenge that she has taken on in the Persian Farsi School is the disbelief that a monolingual approach will work. Currently, text books are written in a bilingual fashion with text in Farsi and comprehension questions in English, which sends a message to students that English is the language of communication and Farsi is just something that we do. She wants to change this to send the message to students that Farsi is the language of communication. The idea of using the monolingual approach throughout, checking comprehension through the target language, while mind-blowing to many, seems completely basic and fundamental.
- Allowing creativity is another challenge that has been encountered. Because the tests have been created based on the information in the textbooks, instructors were reluctant to teach using materials other than the text. To alleviate these issues, efforts are underway to change the tests to allow for creativity.

So, how does the 2+ strategy fit with these efforts? Dr. Hall stated that her plan was to use curriculum as a “forcing function,” meaning that the curriculum has changed to force instructors to do what they need to be doing. The first step was to eliminate the achievement tests in order to promote instructor creativity by unbinding them from the textbooks. They are now using Caretaker Tests, which are monolingual, constructed response exams. This means that students are required to write answers in Farsi, which is difficult; however, students are OK with it and adjust to expectations. The instructors have found it to be challenging, realizing that they must speak only in Farsi and talk about things that the students should be able to understand. Thus far, these changes are making a difference.

There is a greater effort to develop the 2+, 3 level curriculum. They have been using a reverse-engineering technique identifying what a level 3 reader should be able to do and then determining what is needed to get students there. Once the development of the Caretaker Tests is completed, beta testing will be conducted in the classroom to demonstrate to the teachers what it’s going to take to get students to the L3 , giving them the opportunity to provide feedback on how it works in the classroom. Dr. Hall cited examples of measures that have proven to work. Some of the Chairs within Persian Farsi School have implemented Risk programs, such as Reflection Journals, and have seen 76.9% of students graduating with 2+ in listening and 76.9% with a 2+ in reading which

exceeds the 2022 goals. These efforts to get students to 2+ and above have been underway for some time and many of these programs are already achieving the desired results. Students and instructors have provided invaluable feedback. Dr. Hall recounted a recent sensing session that identified two initiatives: Open Architecture and Tailoring of 3rd Semester; both are having a great impact on the student progress.

Dr. Hall presented some examples of how the school is dealing with students with different learning styles and emphasized that communicating with the students up front to explain what the objectives are and why they are being tasked has proven effective for helping those with different learning styles to adapt and adjust in order to complete a task. The Instructor Recertification Course is another resource for faculty development with a focus on preparing teachers to teach at the 2+ and beyond levels. Teachers are also encouraged to understand how they themselves learn. Another very important idea is the creation of a “safe zone,” meaning that it is permissible to speak freely about anything you need to say. More progress is achieved with dissent than if everyone goes along with whatever the boss says. Empowering others to take worthwhile risks is another critical area that helps to empower team members. The creation of Student Recognition Programs has been an effective way of encouraging students to work hard.

Break

Concept of Open Architecture

Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, Provost, presented the concept of Open Architecture.

- **Roots of Open Architecture** – Its origins date back to the 1980s. While at FSI, the realization that ambassadors required level 4 skills and what FSI was producing were level 3. To address that need, the FSI Advance Course, which was the basis of Open Architecture, was created and ran for about six years. It was called the “50/50 Course,” as there were 50 different ways to teach and there were 50 different topics that could be studied. In 2000, NASA was tasked with launching the International Space Station. They requested that a robust Russian/English language program be developed. As an example of Open Architecture, the astronauts would spend 45 minutes working in English and then 45 minutes in Russian. As Open Architecture developed over time, the concept of learning styles and strategies came into being.

Diagnostic Assessments are another concept that was first used in the early 90s in the DLI testing department; these were put on hold until 2006 when the Diagnostic Assessment Center was established. As was noted earlier, Diagnostic Assessment is at the core of Open Architecture.

In 2005-2010, the “hidden classroom” became the focus. This concept is a step beyond looking only at classroom dynamics and goes beyond what assessment can tell you. One example of this is when there are two natural leaders in a classroom; one is a class leader while the other is not. This situation will likely result in a dysfunctional classroom if it is not recognized. If neither student is a class leader, whoever the class leader is will have difficulties. Next in the timeline came Transformative pedagogy at DLI.

- **Post-modern era paradigm shift** – Moving from transmission and transaction to transformative approaches to instruction; a move forward from communicative competence which is the mantra along with moving forward from intercultural communicative competence and developing a bicultural language user. An open architecture syllabus design allows for moving beyond a text book. Materials are very authentic and flexible in nature and in most cases are content-based, tasked-based and diagnostically oriented. Dr. Leaver stated that the materials and projects that students have will be related to whatever is happening in the world on the first day of class and what they will work on linguistically will depend entirely on the students' needs. Dr. Leaver gave an example of the students finding the articles online or other resources rather than having the instructors find and supply the materials. This skill would be present at the intermediate and advanced course level, but not at the basic level. However, students should be able to do this by the 3rd semester of the basic courses.

Adjournment

Dr. Brecht adjourned the meeting at 4:35 pm.

December 8, 2016

Call to Order

Dr. Brecht called the meeting to order at 9:30 am.

Commandant Remarks

1. COL Deppert reported to the group that DLIFLC had celebrated its 75th year anniversary and presented a copy of the commemorative Globe publication to each of the BoV members. He introduced Lingo, the DLIFLC canine mascot, and related the story of how Lingo became the mascot and how, since his arrival, the staff has taken him for daily walks and cares for him.

2. COL Deppert announced to the group that BoV member Mr. Scott Allen was attending his final meeting after six years of service on the board. He thanked Mr. Allen for his service and presented him with a letter of appreciation and a DLIFLC coin. Mr. Allen thanked everyone and expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to be a part of the BoV and lauded DLIFLC as an invaluable institution that is doing tremendous work for the United States.

Administrative Remarks

Mr. Kesten reviewed the agenda for the day.

Concept of Open Architecture- (cont'd)

Dr. Betty Lou Lever, Provost, DLIFLC, continued her presentation on Open Architecture. Dr. Leaver provided a visual example of the results from the diagnostic assessments implemented at DLI to facilitate an open architecture learning environment. She compared ectenic vs. synoptic learners, stating that synoptic learners are more intuitive and do not require information to be broken down, whereas an ectenic student wants the information broken down and explained in greater detail. The ectenic student will struggle at the beginning but will excel at the higher levels when there is a need for greater breakdown of materials to gain a better understanding. For these reasons, assessments are critical for helping students develop learning strategies that help them succeed. The comparison highlighted the challenge an instructor would have in class when both types of learners are in the class. Dr. Leaver emphasized that it is critical that students understand what type of learner they are and that the instructors work closely with them to develop strategies that work for them. Dr. Tovar added that students have Learning Advisors who, with the students and instructors, work to develop learning profiles for each student, meeting with them to revisit their learning profiles throughout the course to help keep them on track. Dr. Hall reported that in addition to Learning Specialists, students participate in a “Zero Week,” learning how to learn a language before the course begins. These programs are designed to help identify each learner’s type, and students are then provided with methods and techniques to help them excel. This strategy helps students stay on track so long as they remember what their learning styles are and not compare themselves to other students. Dr. Leaver continued with her presentation, showing examples of how these assessments and the development of learning strategies will work in an open architecture classroom. She provided examples of exercises that students could use to help them to get past obstacles, based on their learning styles.

Dr. Tovar added that the role of leadership has proven to be a major factor in the success of these in terms of motivating the students. She provided an example of the strategies developed from diagnostic assessments. She described a class in which, based on the learning styles of the students, the teaching team developed activities tailored to the group that included the gradual implementation of open architecture at the beginning of the course, rather than waiting until the third semester. She added that the open architecture concept has allowed teachers to be more flexible with the curriculum and while they will still cover core curriculum, teachers spent two hours per day of class time introducing authentic materials and activities that focus more on speaking and writing; this proved to be very effective for the class. Dr. Leaver interjected that everyone, including Deans, have realized that instructors cannot learn these concepts in one-hour classes. Thus, the Advanced Language Academy was created; it consists of three days of pre-learning for teachers, then a week of instruction on how to implement open architecture, and finally follow-up with action plans and discussion.

COL Deppert explained that while there are students in several different roles, e.g., Cryptologic Language Analysts, Attaches and HUMINT collectors and there is an effort to separate these students, these students are often together in class. However, as far as the associated military skills needed for each of these positions is concerned, there are activities, e.g., the Isolated Immersions, which are purely military skills in which students have an opportunity to take their language skills and put them to use in scenarios that require the use of specific military skills. COL Deppert offered for the members that there is a major difference between the Cryptologic Language Analyst and Translator/Interpreter and because they are very different, it is important that the two not be confused. Also, he mentioned that in the pre-course training (“Zero Week”) training consists of Time and Task Management, Study Skills and also Complex Subjects in the English language, as it is critical that students understand complex topics in English before they can understand and discuss them in a target language.

Dr. Kanbar stated that the way that she envisioned the use of open architecture is to first examine the ILR levels and determine what tasks are associated with each level. She then instructs her teachers to choose materials that are associated with these levels as well as within the curriculum.

Dr. Shevchenko cited that within her team, the ALA training is almost completed; there has been a push to train as many faculty as possible and it has been received quite well. One request from the faculty was to see the examples of how their peers implemented these concepts in the classroom. As a result, some of the faculty offered to present what they had already been doing. Teams showed materials, discussed their experiences, and asked students to present their experiences with these activities. This has been very helpful to the team as a whole.

Dr. Leaver summarized her presentation on open architecture by stating that the implementation of these concepts blur the roles of teacher and student, empower faculty, and create autonomous learners.

Where we stand: DLI is working with the Advanced Language Academy and is looking at making the ALA open to the military members, MLIs, and Associate Deans. Continuing Education is working with UGE and NCS. The envelope is constantly being pushed and is the source of many of these ideas. The feeling is that the entire profession will look different in 10 years.

Official BoV Group Picture

A group photo of the BoV members was taken.

Commandant's Priorities

COL Deppert provided the summary of where DLIFLC is headed.

1. **The Assistant Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness signed and approved the updated Faculty Pay and Compensation Plan on 20 October 2016.** What this means moving forward is that everyone from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the services now consider this as a “must pay” bill but he cautioned that there is still work to be done. Because of the work going on in the Pentagon, the Under-Secretary in the updated policy has stated that this will be a cross-share across the services. Because the updated policy states that it will not take effect earlier than 1 July 2017, there is a lot of work being done to enable the Army to begin paying this in FY18. COL Deppert reported he had informed the faculty at one time and that a Town Hall meeting is planned for later in the month to notify them again and to address their questions.
2. **Accountability for requirement to stay on track with the plan to achieve the “2+ and beyond”.** It is important that there is periodic review to ensure that efforts continue to move in the right direction. As follow up and follow through are difficult, it is very important to ensure that they are done.
3. **To codify the linguist career pathway or a “cradle to grave” process** that can provide/allow for the recruitment of the best new linguists and then provide them with a path for continued development that will benefit them throughout their entire career. Considering the amount of time and money invested in the training linguists, it is imperative that we develop this training path to ensure that the linguists are the best trained and most highly skilled.

COL Deppert stated that the three priorities that he outlined are strategic or long-term goals. He added that the training pathway discussions have been ongoing for months, and that personnel within the Senior Language Authority have formed a subcommittee working on these training paths for the last two years.

Break

Summary of Outbrief

The Board of Visitors expressed their gratitude for being invited to meet at the Linthicum Heights LTD and being introduced to the DLI-CLAS partnership. They recognize that this meeting was arranged at board's request to better understand the scope of DLI operations. They appreciate the opportunity to meet with the DLI UGE

Deans and learned from their experience and vision of the future of DLI.

1. The Board commends the Commandant, his Army sponsors, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense for approving a much needed faculty pay increase. We encourage all in authority to begin distribution of these increases as soon as possible, and as early as July 2017.
2. The Board, and a much broader community of those appreciative of the role of the DLIFLC as a critical national asset, believes the command deserves a level of leadership commensurate with its critical role and size. We request information from the Commandant on leadership levels at comparable institutions within the Army and/or the broader Department of Defense structure.
3. We support the DLI leadership's innovative approach to meeting the challenge of a 2+/2+ graduation goal with a more open pedagogical architecture. We also recognize the risks involved and applaud the intention of DLI to monitor closely the level of success for the endeavor. We note as well the broader implications this has for the language learning community and relevant stakeholders.
4. We commend the Commandant for igniting the fire of leadership and shared governance within the DLI community. In addition, we recognize and encourage the Commandant's pro-active efforts to promote DLI within the military community and the wider civilian population.
5. We encourage the Commandant to continue efforts to codify the life cycle of the military linguist as defined by the linguist career pathway.
6. We recognize the ever-increasing importance of immersion experiences in attaining the higher language proficiency levels for DLI students. We encourage the U.S Army and DLI/Commandant to provide the necessary resources to expand this effort.
7. The Board expresses its appreciation for the Commandant's outreach to us, and we look forward to working with DLI leadership on the upcoming accreditation process.

Closing Remarks

COL Deppert expressed his gratitude to the BoV for their insight and provisional recommendations.

Adjournment

Mr. Kesten adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm

TAB D - Subcommittee Members/Mission/Meeting Purpose

Subcommittee/Board Members:

Mr. Scott Allen, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Richard Brecht, Member, Board of Visitors
Amb. Ruth A. Davis, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. James Keagle, COL, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Ervin Rokke, LTG, Retired, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. Galal Walker, Member, Board of Visitors
Dr. William Whobrey, Member, Board of Visitors
Mr. Craig Wilson, Member, Board of Visitors

Mission:

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLI) is a Department of Defense School under the executive agency of the U.S. Army. The DLI Board of Visitors (BoV) is governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) of 1972, as amended, and is a subcommittee of the Army Education Advisory Committee (AEAC).

The purpose of the DLI Board of Visitors (BoV) is to provide the Commandant, through the Army Education Advisory Committee, with advice on matters related to the Institute's mission, specifically: academic policies, staff and faculty development, student success indicators, curricula, educational methodology and objectives, program effectiveness, research, and academic administration.

Meeting Purpose:

The purpose of the meeting is to provide the subcommittee with briefings and information focusing on the Shared Governance practices across organizations and management to improve communication within Defense Language Foreign Language Institute. The subcommittee will also receive an update on the Institute's accreditation and will address administrative matters.

TAB E- Observers and Guests

No Guests or Observers were present at the December 2016 Meeting.

TAB F - Handouts

The BoV Members received documents. The titles below are in order of presentation.

1. Leadership Development Efforts at DLIFLC
2. Accreditation Update
3. 2016 Army Ethics Training
4. Leadership opportunities and challenges at ILC
5. Leadership opportunities and challenges at UML
6. Leadership Challenges and Opportunities at UPF
7. Introduction to Open Architecture
8. Commandant's Priorities

TAB G - BoV Provisional Recommendations Forwarded to the AEAC for Meeting
conducted on 7 and 8 December 2016:

BoV Provisional Recommendations: Meeting conducted on 7 and 8 December 2016:

1. The Board commends the Commandant, his Army sponsors, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense for approving a much needed faculty pay increase. We encourage all in authority to begin distribution of these increases as soon as possible, and as early as July 2017.
2. The Board, and a much broader community of those appreciative of the role of the DLIFLC as a critical national asset, believes the command deserves a level of leadership commensurate with its critical role and size. We request information from the Commandant on leadership levels at comparable institutions within the Army and/or the broader Department of Defense structure.
3. We support the DLI leadership's innovative approach to meeting the challenge of a 2+/2+ graduation goal with a more open pedagogical architecture. We also recognize the risks involved and applaud the intention of DLI to monitor closely the level of success for the endeavor. We note as well the broader implications this has for the language learning community and relevant stakeholders.
4. We commend the Commandant for igniting the fire of leadership and shared governance within the DLI community. In addition, we recognize and encourage the Commandant's pro-active efforts to promote DLI within the military community and the wider civilian population.
5. We encourage the Commandant to continue efforts to codify the life cycle of the military linguist as defined by the linguist career pathway.
6. We recognize the ever-increasing importance of immersion experiences in attaining the higher language proficiency levels for DLI students. We encourage the U.S Army and DLI/Commandant to provide the necessary resources to expand this effort.
7. The Board expresses its appreciation for the Commandant's outreach to us, and we look forward to working with DLI leadership on the upcoming accreditation process.

Detlev Kesten
Alternate Designated Officer, DLIFLC Board of Visitors
6 March 2017

I hereby certify this 6th day of March 2017 that to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes to be accurate and complete.

Dr. Richard Brecht (Chair)

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. Brecht", is written on a light blue horizontal line.