

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

1 January - 31 December 1990

by

James C. McNaughton
Command Historian

January 1992
Presidio of Monterey, California



DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER

PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93944-5006

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

ATFL-CMT (870-5c)

10 February 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: DLIFLC 1990 Annual Command History

1. The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center has always been an exciting place; the past few years even more so. Student proficiency has continued to climb, and demand is continually expanding for our unmatched expertise in all aspects of foreign language education. Readers of the enclosed annual command history will see how these various trends unfolded during Year One of the post-Cold War era, the year of Desert Shield. Our command historian has performed a valuable service for us by chronicling this particularly exciting twelve-month period in our recent history.

2. The year that began in Panama and ended in the Persian Gulf was certainly dramatic. Our drive to achieve the eighty percent 2/2 goal in all languages gathered momentum. The Middle East School implemented a revolutionary 63-week Arabic curriculum. The Chinese department hosted our first curriculum review. Law enforcement agency training expanded. We held a path-breaking conference on educational technology. Finally, Desert Shield gave us the opportunity to demonstrate our tremendous potential, especially in the area of distance education.

3. We have good reason to feel proud of what we have accomplished together. As our history shows, we have answered the call of duty and are preparing to meet future requirements. We should look to that future with confidence.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Donald C. Fischer, Jr.", is positioned to the right of the third paragraph.

Encl

DONALD C. FISCHER, JR.
COL, USA
Commandant

DISTRIBUTION:
Special

Contents

| | | |
|---------------|--|----|
| One | The DFLP in 1990 | 1 |
| | General Officer Steering Committee | 1 |
| | Requirements | 4 |
| | Operation Desert Shield | 7 |
| | Conclusion | 11 |
| Two | Managing DLIFLC in 1990 | 13 |
| | Command Group | 14 |
| | Vision 90 | 16 |
| | DLIFLC Washington Office | 17 |
| | Operation Desert Shield | 18 |
| | Conclusion | 21 |
| Three | Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990 | 24 |
| | Striving for Proficiency | 24 |
| | Building Excellence in the Schools | 26 |
| | Academic Staff | 32 |
| | Conclusion | 41 |
| Four | Foreign Language Students in 1990 | 42 |
| | US Army Troop Command | 43 |
| | 3483rd Student Squadron | 44 |
| | Naval Security Group Detachment | 44 |
| | Marine Corps Detachment | 45 |
| | Conclusion | 45 |
| Five | Supporting DLIFLC in 1990 | 46 |
| | Garrison | 46 |
| | Facilities Management | 47 |
| | Civilian Personnel Management | 48 |
| | Resource Management | 50 |
| | Information Management | 52 |
| | Public Affairs Office | 54 |
| | Protocol Office | 54 |
| | Command Historian | 54 |
| | Administrative Support Division | 55 |
| | Security Management Division | 55 |
| | Inspector General | 55 |
| | Logistics | 56 |
| | Audio-Visual | 56 |
| | Conclusion | 57 |
| Glossary | | 58 |
| Document List | | 60 |
| Index | | 61 |

Chapter One

The Defense Foreign Language Program in 1990

During 1990 the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) faced its greatest challenge since the Vietnam War: Operation Desert Shield. The hundreds of Arabic and other linguists who deployed to the unforgiving environment of Southwest Asia that summer and fall were the end products of an interlocking set of systems for their recruitment, training, sustainment, and personnel management. Their contributions to the Allied victory were a reflection of the strengths of all those systems. The single most important factor--what turned them into linguists--was the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLI-FLC), where most had received their initial language training. But this was only one part of the process. To understand how the Department of Defense (DoD) was able to put hundreds of military linguists into a remote theater of war it is necessary to look at the DFLP prior to August 1990.

In the first half of 1990 the armed forces were just beginning to grapple with two political earthquakes of the previous year: the collapse of the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe and the American invasion of Panama. In the face of a radically changed national security situation abroad and a looming budget crisis at home, the services were undergoing an extensive re-examination of their force structure, doctrine, and roles. As the services and intelligence agencies struggled to adapt to the new world situation, they began to rethink how many military linguists they would need--and in what languages--in the years ahead. As the Cold War confrontation eased, the services and intelligence agencies anticipated an era of down-sizing and low intensity conflict, the two catchwords most often heard. Both had implications for linguist requirements.

General Officer Steering Committee

DoD Directive 5160.41 designated the Secretary of the Army as Executive Agent for all DoD foreign language training. Army Regulation 350-20 further delegated management responsibility to the Director of Training in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. At the beginning of the year this was Brigadier General Larry G. Lehowicz. He was advised by a joint-service general officer steering committee (GOSC) composed of representatives of the four services, the intelligence

The DFLP in 1990

agencies, and other DoD offices with responsibilities for the DFLP.¹

On January 25, 1990, just weeks after the conclusion of Operation Just Cause, Lehowicz convened the previously scheduled annual meeting of the committee in Monterey, California. As usual, much of their discussions were devoted to initiatives already underway to upgrade resident training programs at the institute (detailed in subsequent chapters). Both Lehowicz and the Deputy Director for Education and Training of the National Security Agency, Whitney E. Reed, continued to press the four services to improve the management of their linguist personnel. They also discussed the most challenging new mission for DoD linguists, arms control treaty verification. The director of the On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA), Brigadier General Roland Lajoie, himself a Russian linguist, briefed the members on the lessons learned during his agency's first two years of existence.

Maintaining adequate levels of funding for language training was a shared concern. Lehowicz assured the other members that the Army would be able to continue level funding, but his staff action officer, Lieutenant Colonel Sandy Outerbridge, admitted that it was still necessary to fight for the dollars. The US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) representative told the group frankly that he was having trouble protecting DLIFLC from future budget cuts and that "he looked to the Executive Agent for assistance with DLIFLC's resource support base."²

But funding, while perhaps the most immediate issue, was not the biggest. The continued high demand for language training virtually guaranteed that the necessary dollars would be found somewhere. For example, the newly formed US Army Special Operations Command in Fort Bragg, North Carolina, had several million dollars to commit for language course development, and

¹DoD Directive 5160.41, Defense Language Program (DLP), 7 Apr 88, and Army Regulation 350-20/OPNAVINST 1550.7B/Air Force Regulation 50-40/Marine Corps Order 1550.4D, Management of the Defense Language Program, 15 Mar 87. For a concise overview, see Lieutenant Colonel Terrance M. Ford, "The Adequacy of the Army's Foreign Language Program," Thesis, US Army War College (1 Feb 90).

²GOSC briefing book, 25 Jan 90; DAMO-TRO, memo, subj: Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Draft Summary Report for 25 Jan 90, 8 Mar 90.

in February the US Congress gave DoD a special \$2 million appropriation for foreign language training to be split equally between DLIFLC and the National Security Agency.

The most important issues involved overall management of linguists. Personnel management for service linguists was the prerogative of each service, and the Executive Agent's authority was confined to exhorting them to conduct their own billet reviews and develop comprehensive linguist life cycle plans. Symptomatic of the difficulties of achieving managerial reform was the services' inability to revise the joint service regulation ever since a new DoD directive had been published in the spring of 1988. The January meeting produced little that was new in this regard, but a follow-on meeting was scheduled in Washington for May. Between meetings much of the routine business of the DFLP was handled by their staff action officers. In March these officers assembled for a special meeting of their own, an annual weekend team-building workshop.

Beyond the GOSC there was no lack of interagency committees and academic groups with an interest in DoD's foreign language training programs. The Intelligence Community Staff had its own Foreign Language Committee, all DoD and non-DoD federal agencies sat together on the Interagency Language Roundtable, and the NATO military language schools banded together in BILC, the Bureau for International Language Coordination. The institute was also an active player in several major academic associations, including ACTFL, the American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages, and CALICO, the Computer-Assisted Language Learning & Instruction Consortium.

An important role for the service program managers was to coordinate their future training requirements. Each spring their representatives met in formal session to hammer out the numbers of training seats required in future years in a process known as the Structure Manning Decision Review (SMDR). In 1990 the SMDR was held in April. Despite the changing world situation, student input to DLIFLC was projected to hold steady. The sudden demise of the German Democratic Republic caused a sharp drop in cryptologic requirements for German, but requirements for other languages were growing, and the Executive Agent extended the cap to a structure load of 3,415 student-years.

When the GOSC principals re-assembled in Washington in May the Army service program manager presented a briefing on Army plans for linguist life-cycle management and the Executive Agent directed the other services to present briefings on their own

The DFLP in 1990

plans at the next annual meeting.³ On July 30, Lehowicz was reassigned after three years on the job, and Brigadier General Richard F. Keller was named as his replacement.

Requirements

The sheer diversity of requirements was to blame for much of the complexity of the Defense Foreign Language Program. Not only did the services have requirements for dozens of languages, but within each language they had needs for different levels and types of proficiency. The system was thus designed to support several major categories of user requirements.

o Cryptologic Requirements

Of the estimated 16,500 military linguists in the services, about three-quarters served in cryptologic assignments. Approximately seventy-five percent of the students sent to DLIFLC for basic language courses went on to assignments with their service's respective cryptologic element after graduation from advanced individual training. The Cryptologic Training Manager was a permanent member of the general officer steering committee, and the National Security Agency was the only user agency to post a permanent representative in Monterey.

The massive changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe were having their effect on the America's signals intelligence activities, particularly those targeted against the East European members of the moribund Warsaw Pact. As the communist governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and East Germany were overthrown, American requirements to monitor their military activities declined sharply. These changes were sure to impact on language training requirements before long.

³DAMO-TR, msg, subj: May 1990 Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), 031235Z Jul 90, included in GOSC briefing book, 21 Aug 91.

⁴For a broad survey of all DoD and non-DoD Federal language requirements, see Ray T. Clifford and Donald C. Fischer, Jr., "Foreign Language Needs in the U.S. Government," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (September 1990), 109-21.

o Treaty Verification Requirements

A small but growing field for military linguists was as interpreters for arms control treaty verification teams. Since the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty had been signed in 1987 the Defense Language Institute had worked closely with OSIA to test and train hundreds of Russian linguists. In a paper presented to the annual meeting of the NATO Bureau of International Language Coordination in Ottawa in June the DLIFLC representative described these new requirements as radically different from previous ones. These training efforts also earned special mention in the *New York Times* in the spring with an article entitled "Soldiers Learn Russian as Language of Peace" that subsequently appeared in *Red Star*. But after an initial flurry of activity in 1988 and the establishment of a special intermediate course at DLIFLC in 1989, the work of OSIA linguists--and the numbers required--grow only slowly. While many foresaw further requirements in Russian and other languages when future arms control treaties were signed, in 1990 there was little change.⁵

o Human Intelligence Requirements

Many observers predicted a shift in the balance of language requirements to non-cryptologic requirements with the end of the Cold War. Treaty verification and Operation Just Cause were pointed to as harbingers of the future. For years the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) had been working to improve human intelligence linguists in the services, and the DIA Training Manager had a permanent seat on the general officer steering committee. Language training for interrogators and counter-intelligence agents was conducted at DLIFLC, but most language training to support the Defense Attache System was conducted in Washington, DC, under DLIFLC's auspices. DIA had also proposed its own final learning objectives for students at DLIFLC that lay a heavier emphasis on speaking proficiency.

⁵Peter Kozumplik, "Language Instruction for Arms Control Inspections: The US Experience," printed in *BILC, Conference Report 1990* (Hürth, Germany: Bundessprachenamt, 1990), 39-44; Susan Chira, "Soldiers Learn Russian as Language of Peace," *New York Times* (1 May 90); ATFL-DR2-AD, info paper, subj: DLIFLC Russian Language Training in Support of US-USSR Treaties, 2 Jan 90, included in GOSC Briefing Book, 25 Jan 90, Tab M.

The DFLP in 1990

Several other programs not under DIA control also fell under the rubric of human intelligence, such as the Army's Foreign Area Officer program, which trained over a hundred Army captains in foreign languages each year under DLIFLC's auspices at Monterey or Washington.

o Special Operations Forces Requirements

Outside the intelligence community, the largest set of language requirements was for the Special Operations Forces, of which the Army was by far the largest component. About five percent of basic course students at DLIFLC were special operations students, and the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, taught another hundred or so students each year in Spanish, French and Arabic in Basic Acquisition Language Training (BALT) courses. In 1990 the US Army Special Operations Command continued several years of effort to develop shorter language courses for non-linguists. The decision was made to replace the Special Forces Functional Language Course (SFFLC), developed under contract in thirteen languages in 1988-89, with a better-quality program named Basic Military Language Course (BMLC), to be developed at DLIFLC.⁶

o Counternarcotics Requirements

The war against drug abuse and its terrible toll on America's social fabric continued unabated in 1990. One aspect of DoD's growing involvement was providing language training and other related support to non-DoD agencies involved in drug interdiction efforts. Federal agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Customs Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service all sent students to DLIFLC in 1990, primarily for Spanish.

o Reserve Component Requirements

The reserve components of all four services remained a great potential source of skilled military linguists. Many were former active duty linguists who had received their initial language training at DLIFLC, had the technical training, and had served at least one duty assignment. Others were native-

⁶Briefing, "SOF Language Training Strategy," presented at the 25 Jan 90 GOSC, included the briefing book, TAB F.

speakers who were attracted to the Reserves or National Guard as a way to serve their new country. Promising in theory, the services had difficulty tapping the potential of their reserve component linguists. Each service managed its reserve linguists differently. The Navy and Marine Corps, with the smallest numbers, had fewer problems than the Army, with thousands of linguists to track and train. Army Reserve and Army National Guard linguists were scattered across the landscape in the Individual Ready Reserve, military intelligence reserve units, National Guard linguist battalions, and other troop program units. During 1990 the Army ODCSOPS began to revive its Reserve Component Foreign Area Officer program. The Air Force Intelligence Agency exercised more direct control through a nationwide network of language detachments. Other Air Force Reserve linguists could be found in Air National Guard and the outstanding Air Force Reserve intelligence units.

Training requirements for reserve component linguists remained elusive. Reserve unit commanders made increasing use of mobile training teams from DLIFLC, and planning was well underway to begin use of the video teletraining to provide proficiency sustainment support for active and reserve units alike.

Operation Desert Shield

This was the system the services had to meet their language training requirements when they were called upon to respond to the challenge of Desert Shield. For all the talk about low intensity conflict over the previous year, an undercurrent of caution remained about the risk of mid-intensity regional conflicts, particularly in Korea and the Middle East, even though these were less likely to be Soviet-sponsored. In a comprehensive policy statement released in the spring of 1990 the Bush Administration warned that "highly destructive regional wars will remain a danger." Over the summer a prominent political scientist published a widely read article warning of the increased likelihood of regional conflicts under⁸ the eye-catching title, "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War."

⁷ "Disarmament, Talks Lead AF Reserves to Help Active-Duty Forces," *Globe* (31 May 90).

⁸ *National Security Strategy of the United States* (March 1990), 6; John J. Mearsheimer, "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War," *Atlantic* (August 1990), 35-50.

The DFLP in 1990

These predictions came true with startling swiftness on August 2, when the dictator of Iraq launched a lightning invasion of his tiny oil-rich neighbor, Kuwait. President Bush moved swiftly to shore up the defenses of nearby Saudi Arabia and initiated what became the largest deployment of US military power since the Vietnam War. The deployment forced the American armed services to search high and low for trained Arabic linguists, and made it clear beyond doubt that the post-Cold War era was one in which American military linguists would continue to play an vital role.

At first the system worked as planned. Early deploying units took their assigned Spanish, German, and Russian linguists, and service personnel managers quickly identified dozens of other Arabic linguists and rushed them to where they were needed most. For example, several Arabic-speaking NCOs were pulled out of DLIFLC and the Goodfellow Technical Training Center almost at once.

But several problems came to light in the first few weeks. First, many of the deploying units, such as the XVIIIth Airborne Corps, had less than their full complement of linguists. These units were the first to receive additional linguists.

Second, most units authorized linguists had requirements for more than one language. Of necessity these non-Arabic linguists accompanied their units.

Third, most Arabic linguists had no previous exposure to the dialects of Iraq, Kuwait, or Saudi Arabia. Most had been trained in Egyptian or Syrian, for years the primary dialect requirements for the services. Modern Standard Arabic was useful, but a lack of familiarity with the local dialects made the linguist's job that much harder.

Fourth and most importantly, most Arabic linguists had low proficiency even in Modern Standard Arabic. In recent years less than a quarter of each graduating Arabic basic course class at the Defense Language Institute had achieved Level 2 in listening and reading, regarded as the minimum skill level required for entry-level job performance. This deficiency was then compounded for many by poor sustainment programs during follow-on training and in their units.

Determining overall requirements, even in gross numbers, was also a frustrating staff exercise, particularly for the

⁹For a description of some of these issues, see BG John F. Stewart, Jr., *Operation Desert Storm--the Military Intelligence Story: A View from the G-2, 3rd US Army* (Apr 91); reprinted in condensed form in *Military Intelligence* (Oct-Dec 91), 22-31.

Army. The general approach taken was to attempt to bring the XVIIIth Airborne Corps up to strength with a full complement of Arabic linguists and leave it at that. Disputes developed about how many Arabic linguists were in the total force inventory and where they were. Each data base gave often widely varying answers. The DLIFLC staff lent staff assistance wherever it could. The presidential call up of the reserves allowed the first large-scale test ever of using reserve component linguists, but they were even harder to locate and call upon than active duty personnel.¹⁰

The services and DLIFLC also looked in vain for someone to set overall priorities for the allocation of linguists and for doling out precious training resources at DLIFLC. At times it seemed like first come, first serve, both for getting more linguists and for getting support from the schoolhouse.

At first the Defense Language Institute confined itself to shipping large quantities of Arabic language training materials to anyone who contacted them and to providing last-minute refresher instruction to deploying units (detailed in the following chapters). But there were definite limits on how much a TRADOC school could do to support a no-notice contingency operation, especially when training lead time was measured in a year or more, not weeks. But with drive and ingenuity the institute did what it could. The Arabic linguists in the 311th Military Intelligence Battalion at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, gave the institute a chance to try out an experimental program to provide video teletraining, using Arabic instructors in Monterey to teach via a two-way television hook-up.

Expanding resident Arabic training was an obvious next step, although it takes over eighteen months for the pipeline to produce an Arabic linguist with even modest skills from the first day of language instruction until the completion of technical training. Nevertheless the institute's staff worked feverishly to set up special courses in Washington to teach the Iraqi dialect to other Arabic linguists. Special short courses were developed by DLIFLC to teach Modern Standard Arabic to MOS-qualified linguists who had studied other languages. These were taught in Washington, DC, and in Beconsfield in the United Kingdom under DLIFLC auspices. Similar courses were begun at Fort

¹⁰Briefing for LTG Reno, DCSPER, "MI Language Support to Desert Shield," 27 Sep 90; and ATFL-W, memo, subj: Desert Shield Language Requirements, 27 Aug 90.

The DFLP in 1990

Lewis, Denver, and¹¹ at the Foreign Language Training Center-Europe in Munich.

Commanders learned rapidly, some to their chagrin, that the effectiveness of their assigned linguists was directly related to the effectiveness of their command language programs before the event. Commanders who had managed their precious linguist assets carefully and who had supported strong sustainment training programs reaped the benefits. Others paid the price in terms of unpreparedness.

By October the Defense Foreign Language Program had done the best it could in meeting the challenge of Desert Shield. Hundreds of Arabic linguists were in-place, many having received last-minute help from DLIFLC before deploying. Many others had been identified and sent to join them in Saudi Arabia and elsewhere, and the services had decided on a six-month rotation policy. In any event, DLIFLC was busily training their¹² replacements and keeping up with all the other requirements.

Then in early November President Bush set a new objective: the unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait, or face the military might of the United States and its allies. Suddenly American defense planners faced a new set of requirements: doubling the troop strength (to include large numbers of units not previously earmarked for the region) and the commencement of offensive military operations by mid-January. At this point the G-2 staff for the US Army, Central Command, called for DLIFLC to conduct an immediate assessment of its language training needs.

The five-man team from DLIFLC, headed by its commandant, Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr., hit the ground in Riyadh on December 1 and took a whirlwind tour of Army military intelligence units. They found hundreds of linguists in desperate need of training equipment and materials, especially in the Iraqi

¹¹Briefing to John W. Shannon, Under Secretary of the Army, 25 Aug 90 (historian's notes). The institute's contributions are detailed in the following chapters. For a brief overview of the institute's activities for the first four months of Desert Shield, see especially the articles in the Globe (28 Sep 90) and ATFL-AC, memo, subj: Lessons Learned, Support of Desert Shield, Just Cause, 11 Dec 90.

¹²DAMI-PII, memo, subj: Linguist Support to Desert Shield, 29 Nov 90. When the Executive Agent, BG Keller, visited DLIFLC on November 30, he reminded the institute not to ignore other pressing non-Southwest Asia requirements.

dialect. Linguists from Germany-based units had been trained in languages such as Russian, German, or Czech. While it was not their original intent to become a mobile training team, the need was so great that an Iraqi-born civilian Arabic instructor taught impromptu classes at every stop and left behind videotapes for further study.

The critical shortage of linguists forced the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence to pursue simultaneously the native-speaker option. After careful negotiations with the Kuwaiti government and within the American intelligence community, three hundred young Kuwaiti men who had been studying at American colleges and universities when their homeland had been captured were inducted into the Kuwaiti army and given a few days of basic military training by the American drill instructors in Operation Desert Owl. These irregulars arrived in-theater in January, just in time to play a role in the desert victory.

Armed with precise knowledge of in-theater training requirements, the returning team galvanized the staff into a crash program of course development that included textbooks, technical learning aids, audiotapes, and videotapes. These materials were shipped off in large quantities just prior to the initiation of hostilities in mid-January.

When Desert Shield finally became Desert Storm, linguists from all four services, especially those in non-cryptologic assignments, played an important role in the coalition victory over the forces of Saddam Hussein, serving at every level from General Schwartzkopf's negotiations with top¹³ Iraqi commanders down to prisoner of war interrogation cages.

Conclusion

Desert Storm came as a shock to the Defense Foreign Language Program after years of essentially static requirements. The long lead-time required to produce a truly proficient military linguist dictated that the war be fought with the existing pool. But the program, and the thousands of military linguists it had produced in the years leading up to the conflict, responded in an outstanding manner. Improvisations

¹³For the war experiences of several DLIFLC graduates, see the stories in the *Globe* (9 May 91 and 17 Jun 91). For a description of prisoner of war operations, see Sgt. Cheryl Stewart, "Joint Interrogation Facility Operations," *Military Intelligence* (Oct-Dec 91), 36-38.

The DFLP in 1990

were still needed, and some weaknesses in the system were identified, but DoD linguists, and the system that produced them, made important contributions to the victory. It made clear once again that military linguists were an essential component of the DoD team. They proved themselves to be able to handle the most diverse and dangerous assignments wherever they were called upon to go, and they accomplished the mission with pride and professionalism. Their colleagues standing guard in other parts of the world could draw inspiration from their example.

Future leaders of the Defense Foreign Language Program will likewise draw lessons from the experience of providing linguists for Desert Storm. The challenge for managers of the program in the years ahead was to apply those lessons to the system to make it work even better next time. Certainly one of the lessons they will draw will be that a strong language training program is just as vital in the uncertain future as it has been over the past fifty years. For this, a robust Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, as described in the next chapter, is an essential component.

Chapter Two Managing DLIFLC in 1990

Managing the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) was a great challenge for its top military and civilian leaders in 1990. But managing the institute had always been a challenge. Civilian faculty and support staff outnumbered its military permanent party by more than four to one; the teachers were predominantly foreign-born and retained the outlooks of more than two dozen distinct cultures; the uniformed staff and student body came from all four services; the students themselves represented the best and brightest young people being recruited into the armed services; and the institute had to remain responsive to all four services, two major intelligence agencies, and several other user communities within the Department of Defense and elsewhere in the Federal Government. Furthermore, the daily work of any academic institution is inherently decentralized, relying on the personal dedication and skill of its hundreds of instructors who each taught small classes isolated from the others.

As if meeting the challenge of resident instruction were not demanding enough, the institute's managers had several other responsibilities, such as constantly updating and improving curricular materials, developing a DoD-wide testing system, supporting command language programs world-wide, and operating a contract foreign language training program. In a static environment that would be challenging enough, but in 1990 the world was rapidly changing, and the institute could not afford to stand still. Although the invasion of Panama had little immediate effect on the institute, it underscored the fact that the post-Cold War world would be one in which the institute would have to become more responsive to new demands and opportunities.

Building new responsiveness was the key management challenge at the beginning of the year, although field commanders and their staffs often had unrealistic expectations about what kinds of flexibility the institute should have. Long-standing criticisms that the institute was inflexible were mentioned in a 1990 Army War College student thesis that reported that this "was generally attributed to DLIFLC's size, civilian staff, general bureaucracy, union restrictions, and funding constraints." He observed that there were "insufficient military personnel within DLIFLC to ensure the expeditious execution of unpopular decisions made by the commandant or the DFLP GOSC," and recommended that the institute "restructure the staff to

Managing DLIFLC in 1990

increase responsiveness, facilitate administrative actions, and reduce bureaucratic layers."¹

While these perceptions were based to a certain extent on outdated information, they contained a kernel of truth, and the institute's leaders could ill afford to ignore them. At the outset of 1990 no one knew that the institute would be called upon to meet a great challenge before the year was out: supporting hundreds of military linguists deploying for Operation Desert Shield. The massive deployment forced the institute to react in unusual ways, to be quickly responsive to its customers in the field, to be flexible and innovative. The institute met the test and more than proved its value as a unique multi-disciplinary center of foreign language expertise, combining experience in instruction, curriculum development, testing, and program evaluation. This responsiveness and flexibility began at the top.

Command Group

Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr., assumed command of the institute in August 1989, fresh from commanding a division support command in Germany. During his first year in command he repeated a single message before many audiences: the institute had to be prepared to adapt to new realities. "Officially, it looks like smooth sailing ahead," he wrote in the DLIFLC Globe in March 1990, "but my personal experience tells me that we must all be prepared to cope with change, especially in these times of political uncertainty and austere funding."²

He urged to institute's staff to leave no stone unturned in the search for more effective ways to teach, looking closely at the student's day, at the potential of computers, and at how to deliver instruction to linguists in the field. He pressed for strict accountability regarding results.

The top-level management structure that Colonel Fischer inherited had evolved over a number of years. It included an assistant commandant, a chief of staff, and a provost. These four had to juggle many balls at once, to include their relationship with external agencies, pushing for internal reforms, and overseeing essential support functions.

¹Lieutenant Colonel Terrance M. Ford, "The Adequacy of the Army's Foreign Language Program," Thesis, US Army War College (1 Feb 90), 98, 126-27, and 125.

²Globe (26 Mar 90), 4.

Colonel Fischer was fortunate to have an experienced assistant commandant by his side. Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF, had served as assistant commandant since 1987, and for the eleven months before Colonel Fischer's arrival, had served as acting commandant. By temperament and experience he was ideally suited for overseeing the day-to-day operations of the school, especially in the vital areas of resource management, information management, and student issues.³

In 1987 the position of chief of staff had been established with two purposes in mind: to supervise the work of the support staff and to get a senior naval officer on the command group of equal grade to the commandant and the assistant commandant. Captain John A. Moore, USN, a Russian basic course graduate, had come in as chief of staff in the fall of 1988. By the time Fischer arrived Moore had carved out a role for himself as the supervisor of a large share of the support operations of the institute, including the civilian personnel office, information management, resource management, and several smaller staff elements (see Chapter Five). Fischer moved to multiply his own personal effectiveness by appointing an administrative officer to his personal staff in January 1990.⁴

Another major slice of the supporting staff reported directly to the school secretary, who supervised the logistics, facilities, and garrison-type support functions for the institute (see Chapter Five). As the year began this was Colonel Vladimir Sobichevsky, a Special Forces officer who had been at DLIFLC since 1987 and who had served as acting chief of staff before Moore's arrival. In April he was replaced by Colonel William K.S. Olds, a foreign area officer and an Arabic basic course graduate.

The provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford, was the chief academic official and the only professional foreign language educator in the command group. He had directed the institute's academic programs under five commandants, and the institute's academic revolution during those years had been in large part of his own design. He directly supervised the eight language schools and coordinated closely with the dean of Program Evaluation, Research and Testing (who by TRADOC policy reported directly to the commandant). His distinguished service won him recognition

³Interview with Col. Cowger, 10 Jul 91.

⁴DLIFLC Memo 10-1 (17 Sep 90) simply described the chief of staff as the "commandant's principal assistant for support and coordination" (para. 3-2c.).

Managing DLIFLC in 1990

at the Department of the Army level in November when he was personally awarded the Decoration for Exceptional Civilian Service by the Secretary of the Army.⁵

Vision 90

When Colonel Fischer first arrived, the institute's key planning document was *A Strategy for Excellence*, first written in 1986. By 1990 this had evolved into a lengthy master plan published by the Resource Management directorate containing hundreds of individual tasks and goals. Its main thrust was the improvement of resident training programs. It was republished with only minor changes every six months.

But by the end of the 1980s, senior Army commanders were moving away from detailed master plans toward shorter "vision statements." Fischer decided to develop his own overarching vision of where the institute ought to be going, based on the TRADOC commanding general's vision statement, his own mission analysis, and a review of earlier planning efforts. To elaborate his vision he consulted with his key staff and brought in an outside management consultant, John B. Lasagna, with whom he had worked in previous commands.

The resulting "Vision 90" evolved through several drafts in the fall of 1989. It combined a list of the objectives the institute had already been given with some general ideas about the future. It was both specific and philosophical, and generally endorsed the directions in which the institute was already moving. What Fischer brought to the process was new energy and brashness. The drive to raise basic course proficiency levels so that at least eighty percent of the students in even the most difficult languages reached Level 2 remained paramount. A close second was support to linguists in the field, and he correctly perceived that this mission would require more command emphasis than the first, which had developed a momentum of its own. For both goals he brought a new enthusiasm for computers and other forms of educational technology, which he sensed were on the verge of crucial breakthroughs in technology and funding.⁶

Once Fischer drafted his vision statement, he worked hard to disseminate it and achieve consensus on it. In connection with this he set goals to achieve accountability from his staff

⁵ "DLI Accomplishments Recognized," *Globe* (12 Dec 90), 24.

⁶ "Vision for DLI," working document (September 1989); COL Fischer interview, 24 Jan 91.

through what he called the "I will" process, by which his subordinates drafted a list of agreed-upon objective statements, each beginning with "I will..." and which would be periodically renewed.⁷ This intensive effort to develop and implement a vision and to lay new stress on support to the field paid off handsomely beginning almost one year to the day after Fischer assumed command, when Operation Desert Shield began.

DLIFLC Washington Office

Another component of the management team was located not on the Presidio of Monterey, but in Washington, DC, where the DLIFLC Washington Office, headed by Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, continued to support numerous programs and initiatives. In January he was realigned under the assistant commandant. Kozumplik represented the commandant to the various agencies and staff offices in the Washington, DC, area. He stayed in close contact with the Executive Agent staff officer, the four service program manager staff officers, and other members of the general officer steering committee. He was the commandant's personal action officer for many of the most sensitive policy-level initiatives such as the New Personnel System, the Board of Visitors, and relations with other federal agencies. The New Personnel System, originally proposed in 1986, was finally introduced into Congress as HR 5276 by the local Monterey congressmen, Representative Leon Panetta, on August 13, 1990, thanks in large part to the cooperative efforts of Kozumplik and Craig L. Wilson (Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) on the DoD side, as well as Alfie Khalil and Joshua Nieman of the National Federation of Federal Employees.⁸

The day-to-day work of the office also involved managing a contract foreign language training program that relied on the Foreign Service Institute and several commercial language training firms. During 1990 at any given time between forty and eighty students were attended language training at the Foreign Service Institute under DLIFLC auspices, at an annual cost of about \$900,000. More than a hundred others on average at any time were also studying at commercial language schools, mostly

⁷Globe (3 Jul 90).

⁸The functions of the Washington Office are described in DLIFLC Memo 10-1, Chapter 5, 17 Sep 90. See the profile in the Globe (30 Jan 91), 14-15.

Managing DLIFLC in 1990

in languages not taught in Monterey. The cost of this contract program rose to \$1.3 million in FY 90, up from \$491,000 only three years, due in part to the closure of ten small language departments in Monterey in 1989. This contract program provided essential flexibility to the institute's response to Desert Shield. Another element of the Washington office was the MOLINK branch, responsible for testing and training all Russian-speaking military personnel assigned to the Moscow-Washington "hot line." During 1990 two of the federal government's finest interpreter/translators from this office, Vladimir Talmy and Stephan Soudakoff, provided critical direct support to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the New York State Police.

Operation Desert Shield

In the tense few months following the start of Desert Shield, Colonel Fischer often had cause to remember the advice of former Army Chief of Staff General Carl Vuono, who used to tell new commanders, "Don't just do the job--make history!" In hindsight his first year in command turned out to be all preparation for the great test of 1990-91. In particular, his insight that the institute should begin to think innovatively about supporting linguists in the field turned out to be prophetic. Hussein's army seized Kuwait on August 2, and on August 7 President Bush directed the immediate deployment of US forces (see Figure 1). The following morning, as the first US fighting elements were arriving in Saudi Arabia, Fischer called his key staff together and directed them to give support to the deploying linguists absolute priority. He also established a Middle East Operations Center under Colonel Olds.

For the first few weeks the institute responded to a wide variety of requests from the field and helped the service staffs begin to define their requirements. Several Arabic-speaking noncommissioned officers were levied, and requests for Arabic language materials in the warehouse jumped up. The Production Coordination Office established tighter inventory control over existing stocks and reprinted several items. Odds and ends of requests for translation assistance came in, but the first inkling of a more active role for the institute came on Saturday, August 18, when the commander of the 311th Military Intelligence Battalion at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, called to ask for a mobile training team for his seventy Arabic linguists. Fort Campbell had been the site of a pilot project the previous year for using a new method of delivering high-quality nonresident instruction: video teletraining. Using Fort Ord's video teleconferencing

system, the institute's regular instructors had taught a refresher Arabic course to these Army linguists. By the following Monday morning an Arabic instructor from Monterey was on the ground at Fort Campbell teaching the Iraqi dialect, while his colleagues were supplementing his efforts over the video teleconferencing system. This capability proved to be both quick and effective.

Meanwhile the institute worked with the services to plan to meet future Arabic language requirements. The Army's primary requirements were for the XVIIIth Airborne Corps and supporting elements. The other services had smaller requirements. The choices were not easy. The institute offered the standard sixteen-week Iraqi dialect course in Washington for linguists who were already proficient in Modern Standard Arabic. In addition, steps were taken to increase the size of input into the resident Arabic basic courses and to switch students already studying other Arabic dialects into Iraqi. Finally, DLIFLC proposed to contract for special 24-week Arabic courses for linguists in other languages who already possessed the technical skills required.

The crisis put the entire institute under great stress. Guards were posted at the entrances, and other security measures were put into effect. Several other staff members were levied as individual replacements. The Middle East School under Dean Ben De La Selva, with its four Arabic departments, felt the strain in particular. Perhaps a quarter of the instructors were native-born Iraqis, and many had relatives still inside the country. The commandant made a special point of speaking directly to the affected instructors to answer their concerns. The extra expense put an extra burden on the Resource Management staff, coming as it did at the end of a fiscal year. The Department of Defense-wide hiring freeze that had been imposed the previous January gave extra headaches to the Civilian Personnel Office as it struggled to recruit and place the needed extra instructors and support staff. Over the first four months the institute shipped out 5,800 sets of Headstart and COPE Arabic courses for non-linguists, 308 Arabic-English dictionaries, and 434 sets of MSA basic course, Iraqi dialect course, and Iraqi interrogator course materials. To coordinate the institute's response better, the commandant named Lieutenant Colonel Richard A. Magno in November to the new position of

⁹See briefing for Under Secretary of the Army John Shannon, 25 Aug 90, and ATFL-TD-O, msg, subj: Language Training for Operation Desert Shield, 072100Z Sep 90.

Managing DLIFLC in 1990

director of Operations, Plans, and Doctrine (OPD) and realigned support operations under the school secretary and chief of staff, making both co-equal and each reporting directly to him.

The director of the DLIFLC Washington Office, Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, and his staff worked feverishly to advise the services on their language training requirements and options. To help in this he activated four Army Reserve officers to serve tours of varying length. He set up contract language programs in Washington and the United Kingdom, where twenty soldiers and three Marines attended the British Defense School of Languages in a DLIFLC-sponsored program. Most of all, he served as a two-way conduit of information between the institute and the services.¹⁰

Through it all, the day-to-day operations of the school had to continue. The Arabic students represented no more than ten percent of all students in training, and the services were reluctant to allow students to switch from other language to Arabic. After all, the other requirements were not going to go away. Both Under Secretary of the Army Shannon, on his August 25 visit, and the Executive Agent, Brigadier General Keller, when he visited on November 30, cautioned Fischer not to neglect these other requirements.

In early November President Bush announced his decision to increase the size of the US commitment to Southwest Asia. The services began at once to deploy new units to the region. These included for the first time units from Europe and reserve component units not previously earmarked for the region. This raised the stakes for the institute as well. Many more Arabic linguists were suddenly needed than had been previously projected, and many more non-Arabic linguists were now on their way to the Gulf. The previously open-ended commitment had been replaced by a deadline that was barely sixty days away.

On November 9 the G-2, US Army Central Command (ARCENT), asked the institute to send a language assessment team. After three weeks of intense coordination and preparation, a five-man team was dispatched to Saudi Arabia, headed by the commandant. The team members were:

- o Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr., USA, Commandant
- o Major Bernardo Nuño, USAF, Associate Dean, Distance

¹⁰For the institute's response in first few weeks, see the special articles in the *Globe* (28 Sep 90); ATFL-AC, memo, subj: Lessons Learned, Support of Desert Shield, Just Cause, 11 Dec 90; and ATFL-W, info paper, subj: DLIFLC Support to Operation Desert Shield, 30 Oct 90.

Education Division

- o Chief Warrant Officer Robert Higgins, USA, Language Program Coordination Office
- o Tech. Sgt. Doug Daniels, USAF, Military Language Instructor, Middle East School
- o Joseph Kallu, Instructor, Middle East School

The team visited over a dozen locations in Saudi Arabia and found hundreds of US Army linguists eager for additional support, to include textbooks, dictionaries, authentic materials, and tape recorders. Some of the materials did not even exist. All of them urged the DLIFLC team to hurry--the January 15 deadline was by that point barely four weeks away.¹¹

Upon their return the team members kicked the institute into high gear. Arabic instructors and curriculum specialists worked feverishly to produce new materials, including an Iraqi "crash course" with specially produced audio and video tapes. Arabic and Persian-Farsi classes were kept in session over the holidays. By the start of Desert Storm on January 17, 1991, the institute had shipped over 15,000 pounds of new materials to units in-theater, with more in the pipeline. The institute had redefined the words "responsive" and "flexible."¹²

Conclusion

The institute's success in riding the roller coaster year that was 1990 proved the importance of a capable and flexible management structure. The year began with US troops winding up a brief, violent campaign in Panama and American intelligence agencies watching the Warsaw Pact dissolve before their very eyes. The pundits and doctrine writers were predicting the coming down-sizing of the Department of Defense, a future "peace dividend," and an era of low intensity conflict. The year ended

¹¹Information on the assessment team is derived from several sources, including action officer files relating to the trip, Aug-Nov 90; "Desert Shield: DLI Team Travels to Saudi Arabia to Assess Troops' Linguistic Needs," *Globe* (14 Jan 91), 12-14; "DLI Team Returns from Gulf Mission," *Monterey Herald* (25 Dec 90); video, "Desert Shield" (Mar 91); interview with COL Fischer, 24 Jan 91; and interview with CW3 Higgins, 30 May 91.

¹²The institute's efforts between the return of the assessment team and the start of Desert Storm are profiled in the *Globe* (14 Feb 91) and the DLIFLC-produced video, "Desert Shield" (Mar 91).

Managing DLIFLC in 1990

with the largest deployment of US forces since the Korean War, resulting in an overwhelming forty-day campaign in January and February 1991 that decisively defeated the largest military power in the region.

The institute's leaders were able to orchestrate a multi-dimensional response to the demands of the crisis, while continuing the dozens of other training missions that were in no way lessened by the crisis in the Gulf. Building upon the strength of the full-time faculty, the institute brought to bear expertise not only in resident instruction, but in testing, distance education, contract instruction, and materials production to contribute to the Allied victory. This capability was based upon the growing excellence of the resident programs at the institute, combined with the vision and energy of the its commandant. But Fischer's vision was not yet complete. While student proficiency in Arabic jumped up dramatically, other languages still had a long way to go, and the New Personnel System legislative proposal died in committee when the 101st Congress adjourned at the end of the year. For all the efforts of the institute's top leaders, the heart of the institute remained its academic programs, which were in the hands of its faculty and academic staff. It is to them that the next chapter turns.

Figure 1
Chronology of DLIFLC Support to Operation Desert Shield¹³

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 2 Aug 90 | Iraqi invasion of Kuwait |
| 7 Aug 90 | President initiates Operation Desert Shield |
| 8 Aug 90 | DLIFLC emergency staff meeting/Middle East Operations Center (MEOC) established |
| 11 Aug 90 | First MLIs deployed |
| 17 Aug 90 | DLIFLC Desert Shield RAC meeting |
| 20-31 Aug 90 | MTT/VTT at Fort Campbell, KY |
| 25 Aug 90 | Briefing for Under Sec of the Army Shannon |
| 27 Aug 90 | Army Language Program Review Committee meeting |
| 5 Sep 90 | Testing of US Army Reserve linguists begins |
| 28 Sep 90 | Briefing for Army DCSPER, LTG Reno, USA |
| 2 Oct 90 | Briefing for Director of Intelligence Community Staff, Lt. Gen. Wood, USAF |
| 18 Oct-2 Nov 90 | VTT at Fort Hood, TX |
| 29-30 Oct 90 | Briefing for Air Force ACSI, Maj. Gen. Clapper, USAF |
| 3 Nov 90 | ARCENT G-2 requests DLIFLC assessment team |
| 8 Nov 90 | President announces expansion of US commitment |
| 9 Nov 90 | DLIFLC Directorate of Operations, Plans, & Training established |
| 26 Nov 90 | DLIFLC Washington Office begins 16-week Iraqi dialect course |
| 29 Nov 90 | Briefing DFLP Exec Agent, BG Keller, USA |
| 29 Nov 90 | UN resolution authorizing use of force |
| 1 Dec-14 Dec 90 | DLIFLC assessment team in Saudi Arabia |
| 3 Dec-4 Jan 90 | VTT/CAS at Fort Riley |
| 14 Dec 90-Jan 91 | Intensive course development begins |
| 17 Dec 90 | DLIFLC assessment team briefs staff |
| 14 Jan 91 | 24-wk Arabic courses in Washington and UK |
| 15 Jan 91 | UN deadline |
| 17 Jan 91 | Desert Storm (air phase) commences |
| 24 Feb 91 | Desert Storm (ground phase) commences |
| 28 Feb 91 | President declares cessation of hostilities |
| 3 Mar 91 | Ceasefire agreement reached |
| 2 Apr 91 | DLIFLC Desert Shield awards ceremony |

¹³This chronology is based in part on Appendix C, Sequential Listing of DLI Actions, ATFL-AC, memo, subj: Lessons Learned, Support of Desert Shield, Just Cause, 11 Dec 90.

Chapter Three Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

A school as diverse as the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center is difficult to capture in a snapshot. The image that comes closest is Language Day. In 1990 the institute opened its doors for this annual event on May 18. More than eight thousand Northern California high school students and their language teachers came to join in a celebration of astonishing diversity. Costumes, food, music, and dance from around the world were on display.

But by the end of the year this image had been eclipsed by a more somber one: an anxious and sweaty soldier under large a tent, water bottle and dictionary in easy reach, straining to pay attention to yet another Iraqi dialect class. At first glance contradictory, the two images bespoke the two sides of the institute, which was both a foreign language academy and a military training school. Never was this more clear than in 1990, the year of Desert Shield.

Over the previous decade the institute had expanded to over eight hundred instructors teaching twenty languages year round, including many that were rarely taught in American schools. After a decade of striving for academic excellence, it was graduating students at the highest ever proficiency levels. The number of basic course graduates who met user-designated graduation standards rose to 62.4%, up from 44.8% just two years before. That meant that half again as many students were achieving the desired level of proficiency, a remarkable accomplishment by any standard. Desert Shield found the service's linguists, in Arabic and all the other languages, better prepared than ever. The result was by no means perfect, but demonstrable progress had been made. During 1990 the institute's classroom instructors and academic staff worked to push even higher.

Striving for Proficiency

The total number of students starting language classes at DLIFLC during FY 1990 held steady at 4,250, close to the average for recent years. This reflected an increase of only 1.75% over FY 1989, and represented an average of about three thousand students in classes on the Presidio of Monterey at any given time during the year. Responsible for the institute's academic programs was the Provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford. Clifford had developed a broad-front reform program under five successive commandants to address all major aspects of the language instruction process, from student entry standards to faculty development to proficiency testing. Key was the conceptual shift towards proficiency-based instruction. The goal had been

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

set by the General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) early the previous year: 80% of basic course graduates should reach Level 2 in listening, Level 2 in Reading, and Level 1 in speaking, measured against Interagency Language Roundtable standards, and the committee closely monitored the institute's progress.

Key to ultimate success was helping the faculty to grow on the job. In January 1990 the GOSC directed the institute to develop a plan to expand faculty training, which the institute presented at the next meeting in May. The eight separate schools picked up much of the load of faculty development in 1990, assisted by the newly hired GS-11 in-service leaders in some schools. The deans and academic coordinators provided in-service training in the afternoons and on student blood drive days. The Faculty and Staff Development Division offered special workshops on Macintosh computers.

Other changes continued to take effect. Team teaching spread throughout the departments, and the average staffing ratio topped 2:1 for the first time in the institute's history. More instructors were promoted to GS-11 to become team mentors, and the institute won approval for adding a second GS-11 to each six-person team.¹ More authentic materials were seen in the classrooms, and some of the traditional language labs were replaced by in-class wireless labs. With the blessings of the GOSC the awarding of diplomas was reinstated following a two year hiatus for all who completed a basic language course. Each student's individual proficiency was recognized by the award of a "linguistic certificate" designating each graduate as a novice, basic, intermediate, or advanced linguist.² A new spirit of cooperation was evident in union-management relations. The Evaluation Division began a new quarterly inspection program of the schools. The provost continued to lay the groundwork for granting associate of arts degrees in the future.

Another component of the academic programs was the role of the military language instructors. Numbering around eighty, less than ten percent of the instructional staff, these

¹See ATFL-CMT, memo, subj: Professional Development and Faculty Recognition, 22 Jun 90.

²For details on this "bar exam" approach, see the briefings presented to the GOSC in May 1990. It was formalized in three regulations published simultaneously on 1 Oct 90: DLIFLC Memo 351-11-1, Graduation Requirements; 351-11-2, Academic Awards Program; and 351-11-3, Linguistic Certification Program.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

experienced noncommissioned officers brought special strengths to the classroom.³

They were especially active in helping develop the curricular materials to meet the final learning objectives specified by the two major user agencies, the National Security Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency. The dean of the Romance School, Peter J. Armbrust, chaired a special dean's council in 1990 to examine FLO implementation. The institute had been working to meet the cryptologic final learning objectives for the Cryptologic Training System (CTS FLOs) for more than a year. During 1990 the military language instructors also helped develop other materials to meet the human intelligence final learning objectives specified by the Defense Intelligence Agency for the General Intelligence Training System (GITS FLOs).⁴ Several MLIs were called away over the summer for duty in the Persian Gulf.⁵

Building Excellence in the Schools

o Romance School

At the beginning of the year the School of Romance Languages was in the limelight under the leadership of its dean, Peter J. Armbrust.⁶ The US invasion of Panama in December 1989 showed the continued need for Spanish linguists in the services.

³ See the GOSC briefing book, 25 Jan 90, Tab D-6; the *Globe* articles on MLIs in the 16 May 90 issue, 12-16; and ATFL-OPD-LP, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Report, 26 Apr 91.

⁴ See the status update on GITS FLOs in the GOSC briefing book, 25 Jan 90, Tab S.

⁵ For general information on the institute's academic programs in 1990, see the GOSC briefing book, 25 Jan 90; the briefings presented to the Board of Visitors, 22 Aug 90 (reprinted in the board's final report, 23 Aug 90); the DLIFLC 1990 annual report to BILC (reprinted in the BILC conference report, pp. 255-70); and the Jan 90, Jul 90, and Jan 91 editions of the DLIFLC master plan, *A Strategy for Excellence*.

⁶ ATFL-DRO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Report of the School of Romance Languages for 1990, 1 May 91; for one soldier's reactions to *Just Cause*, see the *Globe* (5 Feb 90), 6, 9; for the school in general see the profile in the *Globe*, 26
(Footnote Continued)

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

The national war on drugs, which was sending growing numbers of non-DoD law enforcement personnel to DLIFLC for Spanish training, also served to highlight the school's value.

The three Spanish departments maintained their high proficiency standards, with 70% of their FY 1990 graduates from the 27-week basic course reaching the 2/2 goal. In the smaller language branches, student proficiency in Dutch and French hit all-time highs, while Italian and Portuguese held steady. Declining student enrollment in Italian led the branch to eliminate several instructor positions.

This performance was attained despite the loss of three of the dean's top six managers during the year. In February, Dr. Patricia Boylan left as academic coordinator to take a similar position in the Central European School and her place was taken by Ani Frazier, the Central European School's academic coordinator. Mario Iglesias, chairman of Spanish Department B and president of the local chapter of the Federal Managers Association, retired, as did W. Carey Mein, chairman of the Multi-Language Department. The associate dean, Major Bernardo Nuño, USAF, left to become associate dean of the Distance Education Division, and he was replaced late in the year by Major Gregory L. Robinson.

o School of the Russian Language

While Just Cause put much attention on the Romance School, the thirteen Russian departments, spread among three schools, were not far behind. Supplying advanced Russian linguists for arms control treaty verification was a high priority project, and one that garnered much favorable attention for the entire institute. On May Day, 1990, the institute's special On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) course was written up in the *New York Times* and in *Red Star* the following day.⁷ Russian students showed the greatest overall increase in proficiency of any major

(Footnote Continued)

Mar 90; for DEA training see ATFL-DRO, info paper, subj: DLIFLC Support to the Drug Enforcement Administration, 6 Mar 90, included in the briefing book for GEN Foss, 7 Mar 90.

⁷Susan Chira, "Soldiers Learn Russian as Language of Peace," *New York Times* (1 May 90) and a related article in *Red Star* (2 May 90). For details on OSIA training, see ATFL-DR2, info paper, subj: DLIFLC Russian Language Training in Support of US-USSR Treaties, 5 Mar 90, included as Tab A in GEN Foss

(Footnote Continued)

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

language. In FY 1990 fully 80% of Russian basic course graduates met the 2/2 goal, compared to 45% just two years before.

The greatest gains were made by the School of Russian I under the continued leadership of Luba Grant. Fully 85% of the students in these five departments reached the 2/2 mark in FY 1990. The school attributed these gains to its "dedicated professional instructor staff, highly motivated and sincere students, the inspirational staff, and the continued use and development of [its] innovative demanding core course curriculum."⁸

The school worked hard during 1990 to develop a new Russian core curriculum, computer-assisted study programs, and SCOLA television broadcasts. The school also began teaching the six-month On-Site Inspection Agency course. The upgrade of the school's turn-of-the-century wooden buildings continued with the installation of new heating systems over the winter.

o School of Russian Studies

The second Russian school, the School of Russian Studies, virtually tied the first with 84% of its graduating basic course students reaching 2/2. The last class of FY 1990 graduated 92% of its students at 2/2, the highest ever for such a large class. The school's dean, Dr. Alex Vorobiov, stressed faculty development as a route to increased student proficiency. Teaching for proficiency, redesigning the test system, use of SCOLA broadcasts and other authentic materials, and computer-assisted study were all part of his winning strategy. That spring the school's associate dean, Major John Eschrich, who was also the⁹ first OSIA coordinator for the institute, retired from the Army.

(Footnote Continued)
briefing book, 7 Mar 90. See also LTC Peter W. Kozumplik, "Language Instruction for Arms Control Inspections: The US Experience," paper presented at the 1990 annual BILC conference, reprinted in the conference proceedings, 39-44.

⁸ATFL-DR1-AD, memo, subj: School of Russian Language (DR1) Annual Historical Summary, 20 Apr 91. See also School of Russian 1, DR1 News and Views, I, 1 (Spring 1990).

⁹See ATFL-DR2-AC, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for DR2 (School of Russian Studies) Calendar Year 1990, 1 Apr 91; and the profile in the Globe (27 Apr 90).

o Slavic School

The Slavic School was a hybrid organization, half Czech and half Russian, formed in the summer of 1989.¹⁰ The dean, Betty Lou Leaver, pushed faculty development, teaching many workshops herself and publishing a monthly newsletter. She herself took Czech instruction, while her academic coordinator, Dr. Maurice Funke, studied Russian.

Student proficiency in the school's three Russian departments jumped from 44% in FY 1989 to 63% in FY 1990. At the same time attrition was halved. In June 1990 they graduated their first Foreign Area Officer class, which had previously been taught by the School of Russian Studies.

The three Czech departments were on an emotional roller coaster during 1990 after the Velvet Revolution of the previous year. Student proficiency held steady at 61% and attrition was also halved. In September the dean conducted a special review of the Czech curriculum. Several of the instructors visited their homeland that spring for the first time since 1948, but the same political changes caused the US military to project sweeping reductions in their training requirements in Czech.

o Asian School

The Asian School under the leadership of Dave Olney took a new look at its largest language, Chinese, when the institute's first formal Curriculum Review met in June. Only 14-15% of the department's graduates could meet the 2/2 standard on the DLPT III in the mid-eighties. By FY 1990 this had risen to 38%. The Chinese Curriculum Review and a simultaneous Chinese Technology Task Force made numerous recommendations to improve the program. A doubling of student input in just two years caused the Chinese Department to split into two in December.¹¹

¹⁰See the profile in the *Globe* (22 Feb 90).

¹¹For a detailed picture of the Chinese program as it developed to 1990, see the materials generated by the Chinese Curriculum Review and Chinese Technology Task Force, to include the read-ahead materials and the final reports, as well as DLIFLC, **Master Plan: Strategies for Excellence**, Parts I-III, Jan 91, Tab II-12C. For the Asian School in general see the profile in the *Globe* (12 Sep 90); for the Chinese Curriculum Review see the *Globe* (3 Jul 90) and the briefings to the GOSC 21

(Footnote Continued)

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

The other departments did not receive as much attention. Student proficiency in the Persian-Farsi Department returned to the level of previous years after a one-year rise and the introduction of the DLPT III. Japanese, Tagalog, Thai, and Vietnamese continued to produce students with high proficiency scores.

o Korean School

Student proficiency in the Korean School, which had been split off from the Asian School in the summer of the previous year to accommodate rising student enrollment, was up only slightly to 34% during FY 1990. The dean, Charles Cole, and the school's other leaders all worked hard to boost proficiency, but results in the year-long basic course did not become visible until late in the year. For classes graduating in the last quarter of FY 1990 and the first quarter of FY 1991 the rate rose to over 40%. As in the other schools, instructors in the Korean School developed new authentic supplementary materials, produced computer-assisted study applications, and took a close look at the testing component of the course. Faculty professional development efforts were extensive, and the school published the first volume of an academic journal, *Dialog on Learning Korean*. The school's own extensive self-examination culminated in February 1991 in a formal Korean Curriculum Review.¹²

The school saw several key leaders retire or change jobs during the year. Dr. Namgui Chang, the academic coordinator, Frank S. Synn, the chair of Korean Department B, and the associate dean, Lieutenant Colonel William Cashel, USAF, all retired. Joe Kwon, chair of Korean Department A, was named academic coordinator, Alice K. Lee took over Korean Department A, William Chee took over Korean Department B, and Major Claude E. Hunter arrived from Korea to become the new associate dean.

(Footnote Continued)

Aug 91. See also ATFL-DAS-XO, memo, subj: CY 90, Historical Summary, 31 Dec 91.

¹²ATFL-DKO-AC, memo, subj: DKO Annual Historical Summaries for 1990, 15 Apr 91. For a detailed picture of the Korean program as it developed through 1990, see the materials generated by the curriculum review, to include the read-ahead book, the in-briefing on 11 Feb 91, and the final report.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

o Central European School

The Central European School combined the two key languages of the decades-old superpower confrontation in Central Europe: German and Polish. Under the leadership of Dr. Martha Herzog in 1990 the school saw a modest increase in proficiency in the German departments (from 46% to 55% at 2/2) and holding to recent gains in Polish proficiency (at 52%).¹³

The three German departments were the first to feel the effects of the end of the Cold War. Well before the German Democratic Republic was finally pushed aside in October 1990, student load at DLIFLC was dropping. The number of students to graduate from the 34-week German basic course fell by 31% compared to the previous year, and faculty cuts were projected.¹⁴ Despite these changes the school pressed forward with improvements to the curriculum and with faculty professional development. A variety of computer programs helped the school retain its reputation as a pace-setter in the use of technology in the classroom.

In two key leadership changes, Major Gregory Robinson was replaced as associate dean by Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Cervone, USAF, and Ani Frazier was replaced as academic coordinator by Dr. Patricia Boylan.

o Middle East School

The year 1990 was shaping up to be an eventful one for the Middle East School even before August 2. Under its dean, Ben DeLaSelva, the school was implementing a new 63-week Arabic basic course. Symbolic of the change was the new palm-tree logo the school adopted early in the new year. The commandant himself sat in on the first few weeks of the new course in February. Basic course classes graduating before August reached 30% 2/2, half again as high as in previous years.¹⁵

¹³ATFL-DCE, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1990, 12 Jun 91; see also the profile in the Globe (3 Jul 90).

¹⁴The Civilian Personnel Office published a special bulletin for all employees on reduction-in-force procedures in December.

¹⁵For a brief review of the background of the 63-week course see ATFL-TDR, info paper, subj: 63-week Arabic Basic
(Footnote Continued)

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

Desert Shield thrust the Middle East School onto center stage. Hundreds of its graduates were rushed to the scene, and dozens of its instructors were plunged into anguish with anxieties about their families and friends still living in the threatened region. The instructors were called upon to work all the harder to make an irreplaceable contribution to the Allied coalition of Arab and Western states opposed to Saddam Hussein's territorial ambitions. Arabic instructors, including some retired instructors, became pioneers in video teletraining. Other went off on mobile training teams. Many others worked on special course development projects. Several military language instructors received short-notice deployment orders and went to serve directly.

The classes in session during the period of Desert Shield graduated in the early months of 1991 with the highest proficiency scores ever recorded in Arabic. Fully 63% reached 2/2, three times the historic norm.

The other language programs in the Middle East School were not to be outdone. The Turkish Branch graduated 67% of its students at 2/2, based on a new DLPT IV, three times its historic norm. Greek and Hebrew also showed some gains.

Academic Staff

Most academic support functions were managed outside the eight language schools. These also fell under the general supervision of the provost, with the exception of the Program Evaluation, Research, and Testing (PERT) Directorate, headed by Dr. John L.D. Clark, who reported directly to the commandant. The provost himself was aided by a military assistant, Lieutenant Colonel Helen Brainerd, USAF.

Those functions not under PERT were supervised for most of the year by two men, Dr. Vu Tam Ich, and Lieutenant Colonel Jack Golphenee, who divided the divisions among them under an informal arrangement reached the previous year. When Golphenee retired he was replaced by Lieutenant Colonel Richard A. Magno, and Ich announced his retirement late in the year.

The pressures of Desert Shield, together with the flexibility promised by the Army's new personnel management system, Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget (MCB), described in

(Footnote Continued)

Course, 5 Mar 90, in briefing book for GEN Foss, 7 Mar 90, Tab D; for the logo, see *Globe* (5 Feb 90), 15; for details on the school in general before Desert Shield, see the profile in the *Globe* (18 Jun 90).

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

Chapter Five, led the commandant and provost to reorganize these functions once again at the end of the year. Clifford described the benefits as including improving student proficiency, reducing overhead costs, and increasing cooperation between faculty and academic staff personnel.¹⁶ When the plans were first announced in early November, Magno was named the first Director of Operations, Plans, and Doctrine, with authority over Nonresident Training (to be renamed Distance Education), the Language Program Coordination Office, and the Resident Training Division. (The Reserve Forces Advisor was originally planned to be subordinated to DOPD, but he was allowed to report directly to the assistant commandant instead.) Two new civilian dean positions were created. Clifford named Dr. Martha Herzog as the Dean of Curriculum and Instruction, with authority over three divisions: Faculty and Staff Development, Curriculum Development, and Educational Technology. Dr. Mahmood Taba Tabai was named Dean of Academic Administration, with authority over the Aiso Library, Academic Records, the Registrar, and Program Management. The Area Studies office was allowed to remain free standing.

During 1990 the Program Evaluation, Research, and Testing Directorate continued under the leadership of Dr. John L.D. Clark. He was assisted by associate dean Lieutenant Colonel Russell Webster, USAF, who was replaced in June by Lieutenant Colonel William Oldenburg, USAF.

o Testing

The Testing Division continued in 1990 under the leadership of Dr. Dariush Hooshmand. His division was reorganized early in the year to form a Test Administration Branch, headed by Scott Clausen, and Test Project Branch, headed by Ba-Nhon Le. The expanded division took over Bldg. 634. In addition to a heavy load of in-house test and tape scoring, the division was involved in support to external agencies and in developing a new generation of tests.¹⁷

The Defense Language Proficiency Test program continued to make great progress during 1990 and won ever-wider recognition

¹⁶These plans were first made public at the commandant's staff call on November 6, 1990, and were described in the Globe (14 Jan 91). See also ATFL-RMM, memo, subj: Organizational Changes, 15 Feb 91.

¹⁷For information on PERT and its subordinate elements see ATFL-ES, memo, subj: PERT Annual Summary, 30 May 91.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

outside the Department of Defense. In March the American Council on Education approved the awarding of college credit for DLPT IIIs and DLPT IVs, and the US Drug Enforcement Administration turned to the institute for help in testing its agents by telephone in seventeen languages for proficiency pay. When the services began to call up reservists for Desert Storm in August and September, they also turned to the division for help in testing military linguists.

The last of the DLPT III-series of tests (in Romanian) was completed early in 1990, but project teams were already hard at work on several DLPT IVs. Complete batteries were prepared in Arabic, Japanese, Tagalog, and Turkish.

o Evaluation

The Evaluation Division under the leadership of Dr. John Lett saw changes continuing in 1990. The Internal Evaluation Branch revised the procedures for processing Student Opinion Questionnaires (SOQs) and moved from the mainframe computer to a stand-alone PC. The first year of performance for the new SOQ system, which had been completely redesigned and were being centrally scored, was assessed in December. In August John Neff was named the first head of the External Evaluation Branch. His branch quickly took over the administration of the twice-yearly curriculum reviews and continued to supervise the exchange of student data with the Goodfellow Technical Training Center, where over half of the institute's graduates went for follow-on technical training. In February the branch began to exchange data by computer modem.¹⁸

The institute also became more active in evaluating other programs, such as evaluating the effectiveness of the Cultural Orientation Program for Egypt (COPE) in March. Early in the year the division published the first set of evaluation guidelines for command language programs, DLIFLC Pamphlet 351-1. The division later contracted with the Institute for Simulation and Training, the contractor for the Educational Technology Needs Assessment, to conduct an evaluation of a pilot computer-assisted study program in the fall using Macintosh¹⁹ computers at Fort Ord, California, and Fort Lewis, Washington.

¹⁸In addition to the PERT annual summary, see the DLIFLC Evaluation Program briefing, 31 Jan 91.

¹⁹See the draft evaluation plan [Sep 90].

o Research

Lett also directed the institute's research efforts, much of which were conducted by contractors. Overall the institute spent \$1.568 million on contracted research during FY 1990, three times the level of the previous two years. A large volume of data began to emerge from the largest research project underway, the Language Skill Change Project. The first results relating to language skill change immediately following graduation were presented in December.²⁰

The Educational Technology Needs Assessment also continued to produce valuable results as it neared the end of its projected time span. The Chinese Technology Task Force in the spring was one result. The institute credited this project with "providing extensive and essential state-of-the-art information which will help DLIFLC and other DFLP organizations make optimal and cost-effective use of educational technology in both resident and nonresident contexts." The project directors organized a major two-day conference on educational technology at the institute in October.²¹ The division also worked with the US Army Research Institute to develop a new Defense Language Aptitude Battery.

On a smaller scale, the division became involved in a project to study student learning strategies with the goal of developing learning strategies centers to help students become better learners. It also published two new policy memoranda on the support and coordination of research conducted by the institute's own faculty²² and staff and research conducted by non-DoD researchers.

o Nonresident Training

The support of command language programs was an area of growing involvement for the institute even before August 1990. Desert Shield raised it even higher on the institute's list of

²⁰"Language Skill Change Project: Interim Results," briefing presented by Dr. Frank O'Mara, PRC, Inc., 13 Dec 90.

²¹William J. Bramble and David L. Hosley, eds., *Improving Foreign Language Teaching through Technology*, Conference Proceedings (Orlando, FL: Institute for Simulation and Training (March 1991). See also the summary in the *Globe* (15 Nov 90), 5.

²²DLIFLC Memos 351-18 and 351-19, both dated 1 Nov 90.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

priorities. The lead agency at DLIFLC was the Nonresident Training Division, headed by Joe Yonan. The most traditional form of support, supplying course materials for nonresident refresher/maintenance programs, continued apace, and 1990 saw the completion of three Proficiency Improvement Courses (PICs) in Russian, Czech, and Polish under contract with HumRRO International. Preparations were made²³ to develop PICs in Spanish and French using in-house resources. The number of mobile training teams continued to expand. In 1990 the institute sent out thirty-six teams in ten languages.

Support to command language programs underwent several changes. The institute co-sponsored a language program manager's workshop at the Foreign Language Training Center Europe in Munich in April. Later that year Dr. Clive Roberts, the chief of the DLIFLC language training detachment at US Army-Europe headquarters in Heidelberg was replaced by Dr. Gerd Brendel. The institute was gradually exporting its expertise in managing language training programs. Later in the year work began on revising DLIFLC Pam 350-9 to turn it into a "how-to" manual for language program coordinators. The Evaluation Division also conducted an evaluation of the US Army Forces Command language program. When Desert Shield began, over forty language program managers were attending the second annual language program manager workshop in Monterey.²⁴

To support this expanded role the division was taking a hard look at its resourcing and staffing. Several key staff members retired or were reassigned, the TRADOC Management Engineering Activity (TRAMEA) conducted a survey of the office, and some new positions were created. By the end of the year the commandant decided to give the office a new name, the Distance Education Division.

During Desert Shield the division became a hub of activity. Thousands of pounds of instructional materials were shipped to deploying units and new materials were developed and reproduced in short order. Video teletraining came of age in the fall of the year, as Army units in Fort Campbell, Kentucky, Fort Hood, Texas, and Fort Riley, Kansas, exploited this emerging technology.

²³ATFL-OPD-DE-P, memo, subj: DE Input for CY 1990 Annual Historical Summary, 7 Apr 91. See also DLIFLC Pam 350-5, Catalog of Instructional Materials, Jan 91.

²⁴Nonresident Language Program Newsletter (1st Q, FY 91).

o Curriculum

Most of the courses taught at the institute were under some form of revision during 1990 as teachers added supplementary materials and new student activities to boost student proficiency as measured by the DLPTs. The precise procedures for large-scale course revision were themselves under constant revision. The formal DLIFLC memorandum on course development, DLIFLC Memorandum 5-2, was republished on 1 July.²⁵

The task of curriculum development had become much more complex in recent years. The Curriculum Division, headed by Dr. Mahmood Taba Tabai, had invested heavily in Xerox computer systems to help with the publishing business. Many course developers were looking more and more to desk-top publishing and computer-based exercises. In addition the underlying administrative tasks had to be continued, such as maintaining a formal program of instruction document for each course.²⁶

Just keeping track of course development efforts was complex. The Middle East School was involved in a massive effort to redesign the Arabic basic course for a new 63-week schedule. Work was also underway on the Polish, Portuguese, Tagalog, and Vietnamese basic courses. The office also provided technical oversight for contract course development in a wide variety of courses, including several Proficiency Improvement Courses, the Special Forces Functional Language Courses, and two Cultural Orientation Programs, COPE-J for Jordanian, and COPE-PGN for the Northern Persian Gulf dialect. Other course development work was being done in the Educational Technology Division.²⁷

The experience of supporting Desert Shield, and especially the experience of rapidly developing tailored course materials in December and January 1990-91 showed the importance of maintaining a strong curriculum development capability in-house for contingency response.

²⁵ATFL-DCI-C, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1990, 5 Mar 91.

²⁶For a detailed overview of the Xerox-based Electronic Foreign Language Training Materials Development System (EFLTMDS), see DLIFLC, **Master Plan: Strategies for Excellence**, Parts I-III (January 1991), Tab II-8.

²⁷For a detailed summary of course development activities in 1990, see DLIFLC, **Master Plan: Strategies for Excellence**, Parts I-III (January 1991), Tab II-12A.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

o Educational Technology

The institute was riding the tiger of technological change at the outset of the new decade, as the potential of interactive video, personal computers, and satellite transmission became obvious. The office in the middle of this technological revolution at the institute was the Educational Technology Division, headed by Lieutenant Colonel Sharon D. Richardson, USAF. In May the division presented a special educational technology master plan to the GOSC, and it co-sponsored a special conference on educational technology in October, and the commandant took over as chairman²⁸ of the D'ECOLE committee for educational technology.

The institute was learning that educational technology did not have to be expensive. The SCOLA program to receive live television broadcasts from abroad, which came at very low cost to the institute, finally matured in 1990 as the hardware came together and instructors began to use it. The commandant directed that the students be issued small Walkman-type recorders instead of the bulky Bell & Howell models used previously. Major projects were underway to develop interactive video courses in several languages.

The year would also be known as the year of the Macintosh computer. The institute ultimately acquired seventy-six. Hundreds of instructors were given an orientation to the system late in the year, and a number were placed in the Aiso Library for student use. Others were used to test nonresident applications at Fort Ord and Fort Lewis. That fall the institute ordered two dozen Unisys 386-based systems under the Department of Defense Desktop III contract with funds provided by the National Security Agency. When they arrived at the end of the year the division launched a major effort to transfer what had been learned on the Macintosh to an IBM-compatible platform using Windows 3.0 multimedia software.

²⁸For information on educational technology programs during 1990 see ATFL-DCI-ET, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary Submission, 30 Apr 91; materials included in the GOSC briefing book (17 May 90), Tab H; and DLIFLC, **Master Plan: Strategies for Excellence**, Parts I-III (January 1991), Tab II-10. See also the profiles in the Globe (27 Apr 90 and 16 May 90).

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

o Faculty & Staff Development Division

The Faculty and Staff Development Division under the leadership of Dr. Neil F. Granoien continued to play a key role as an agent for change within the institute, together with the Training Branch in the Civilian Personnel Office. Early in the year these two offices signed a memorandum of understanding delineating their respective spheres of influence. The Faculty and Staff Development Division continued with a heavy load of professional development training, including the instructor certification course and a new program for supervisors called "Leadership Education and Development (LEAD)." The division published another issue of the institute's professional journal, *Dialog on Language Instruction*, and four more faculty members earned a Master of Arts in the Teaching of Foreign Languages from the Monterey Institute of International Studies.

The division also was deeply involved in the diffusion of educational technology within the institute. In conjunction with the Curriculum Division and the Educational Technology Division, the office offered training in using the Xerox Star for course development, developing interactive video programs, and for using video in the classroom. The largest program was launched in the fall to give over six hundred instructors a basic introduction to the Macintosh computer.

o Area Studies

The Area Studies office continued to manage several complex programs during the year. The founder of the Foreign Area Officer orientation program at the institute, Lieutenant Colonel James C. Wise, retired in September and was replaced by Lieutenant Colonel Terry D. Johnson. During the year the number of Army Foreign Area Officers attending language training at the institute rose to over one hundred. Two one-week Foreign Area Office Orientation Courses were taught for the active duty students, and two special two-week courses were offered to 144 Army Reserve Foreign Area Officers. Other significant aspects of the program included the guest speaker program, obtaining authorization for the spouses of foreign area officers to

²⁹ATFL-DCI-FS, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1990; ATFL-CPT, memo for record, subj: DLI Training Program Responsibility, 5 Jan 90. See also the extensive briefing on faculty professional development presented to the GOSC in May 1990 and to the Board of Visitors in August 1990.

Teaching Foreign Languages in 1990

receive Headstart materials for self-study, and changes in the funding of follow-on graduate schooling that significantly increased the workload for the FAO coordinator.³⁰

The DLIFLC chaplain, Chaplain (Major) John Babcock, continued his educational work within the institute. He especially focussed his efforts on building an area studies component into language courses, especially as the institute moved toward the granting of the associate's degree. He also oversaw a changing of the guard in the Pancultural Orchestra, when Ted Gargiulo was replaced by Claire Horn.

Area Studies also took on a new mission during the year. When the Presidio Officers and Faculty Club closed in the spring due to declining membership, the institute formed a committee to study alternative uses. This committee developed a plan to re-utilize the building as a multi-use conference facility, and the gracious and historic building reopened in November as the International Language and Culture Center under its new director, James J. Broz, Jr.³¹

o Aiso Library

During 1990 the Aiso Library continued to support the institute's academic programs with books, periodicals, and audiovisual materials in dozens of foreign languages under the direction of Gary D. Walter. In the fall the library became a test bed for student use of Macintosh computers.

o Resident Training

The management of any school like DLIFLC required that a number administrative functions be performed without which it could not continue. Many of these critical administrative tasks were handled by the personnel in the Program Management and Resident Training offices. These offices faced reorganization

³⁰ATFL-AS, memo, subj: Area Studies 1990 Annual Historical Summary, 8 May 91. See also the profile in the *Globe* (10 Apr 90).

³¹ATFL-CS, memo, subj: International Cultural Center, 28 Jun 90, and related articles in the *Globe* (12 Dec 90), 8.

and personnel turnover during 1990, but somehow got the mission done.³²

Conclusion

The first year of the post-Cold War era was a turbulent one for the institute. The eight language schools and the supporting staff offices tried to navigate through these uncertain waters as best they could. Teaching a foreign language requires skill and patience; it is not something that can be done in a day or a week. Changing habits of teaching takes even longer. The faculty and staff worked to teach their students well, all the while laying the groundwork for teaching future students even better. In department after department changes were made in big ways and small to improve the process, to graduate more proficient linguists. No corner of the institute's academic programs escaped review. The centerpiece of the reforms was the shift to proficiency-based instruction. This placed the focus on the student, the subject of the next chapter.

³²For the Resident Training Division, see ATFL-OPD-PS, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Report for TDR, now Plans and Scheduling, 23 Apr 91. For the creation of the new operations office late in the year see ATFL-OPD, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Report for DOTD, now DOPD, 23 Apr 91. See also the profile in the Globe (28 Aug 90).

Chapter Four Foreign Language Students in 1990

The institute's leaders took a new look during 1990 at the student's role in the learning process. In previous years, reforms had tended to address the teaching side of the equation, but the learning side also showed great potential for gains. Many people suspected that students were not always learning at their peak efficiency while sitting in classrooms or studying at home. At their January 1990 meeting Colonel Fischer told the General Officer Steering Committee that the students could play a more active role in the process--that improvements could be made in student effectiveness. One way to get the students more "turned on" to learning was computer assisted study. The institute made its first tentative steps in this direction in 1990.

In FY 1990 the monthly average number of students held steady at 2,989 reflecting an annual input of 4,460, close to the level of recent years. The barracks were filled to 110-125 percent of capacity, and due to service scheduling problems the number of students on hand exceeded the number of classroom seats available by 5 to 8 percent during much of the year.¹

The institute took advantage of this opportunity to experiment with pre-instruction in English grammar and learning strategies before students began their language classes. During the year this blossomed into a formal Learning Strategies Project coordinated by the Research Division. In June the institute invited several outside experts to Monterey for a four-day technical working session. Command language program managers in the field were also looking for innovative ways to stimulate and motivate their linguists. In August, the US Army I Corps held the first-ever "Language Olympics" at Fort Lewis, Washington.

The question of student effectiveness was addressed from a different angle by the troop unit commanders. Military requirements, ranging from common military skills training to physical fitness training, had long been thought by many to conflict with language learning. Colonel Fischer asserted that both were equally necessary to produce military linguists and reminded students that "a military career is a challenging one. Service

¹ATFL-TPC, info paper, subj: Current Student Overfill (Awaiting Class), 5 Mar 90, included as Tab N in GEN Foss briefing book, 7 Mar 90.

Foreign Language Students in 1990

members will always live demanding lives. We must have people who are positive, productive and used to giving 110 percent."²

In fact, all four troop units became more active participants in the language learning process during the year, offering more study halls, counselling and remediation. The Navy and Marine Corps detachments even set up the first computer labs for evening study.³

In the weeks after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait the students tackled their studies with a new intensity, and not just those studying Arabic. Desert Shield was a sobering reminder that they were military linguists in training and that they might someday soon be called upon to use their language skills in combat. They had to be soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines first before they could be linguists. Their jobs--and possibly their survival--required a high degree of competence in both.

US Army Troop Command

Fully two thirds of the students at DLIFLC were soldiers (FY 1990 input = 3,039) assigned to the US Army Troop Command. At the beginning of the year Troop Command was led by Lieutenant Colonel Donald B. Connelly. In June he was replaced by Lieutenant Colonel Harry K. Lesser, Jr. The new commander continued the trend toward improving the "soldierization" training program for initial entry trainee students. He developed the first Mission-Essential Task List for Troop Command, implemented Sergeant's Time, and completed the construction of an arms room for the on-post storage of weapons for military training. Lesser also made sweeping changes to Troop Command's training programs to support language instruction better, including moving physical training to the afternoon and reducing it from five to three days per week. The S-3 section began to use computers to manage its training, to include the Standard Army Training System and the Training Management Information System.

²Globe (10 Apr 90), 4.

³Many of these changes are detailed in the DLIFLC master plan (Jan 91), Tab II-17. See also the comments by the assistant commandant, Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF, in his end-of-tour interview, 10 Jul 91, 13-15.

Foreign Language Students in 1990

They also, together with the other troop units, gained access⁴ to the Army Training Resources and Requirements System (ATRRS).

Army students also found time for many community and athletic activities. The old gymnasium, Lewis Hall, was saved from closing by the efforts of several noncommissioned officers and other soldiers⁵, using student casuals and hundreds of hours of off-duty time.

3483rd Student Squadron (ATC)

The next largest group of students was US Air Force personnel assigned to the 3483rd Student Squadron (Air Training Command), under the command of Major Bruce Betts, USAF. A total of 760 Air Force students began training in FY 1990, representing 17 percent of the total student input.

Administrative support was provided by a separate office, Operating Location, 323rd Air Base Group, a sub-element of Mather Air Force Base. In the spring of 1990 this was renamed Operating Location, 323rd Mission Support Squadron.

Naval Security Group Detachment

Compared to Air Force students, about half as many Navy students, 389, began language training in FY 1990, representing 9 percent of the total. These students, under the command of Lieutenant Commander Kent H. Kraemer, USN, had the highest aptitude scores of any service measured by the DLAB. The Navy, together with the Marine Corps Detachment, led the way with establishing a computer study hall for the students in a closed dining facility, using additional computers purchased by the National Security Agency.

The Navy made its presence known on the Presidio during the year. In January the Commander of the Naval Security Group Command personally assisted in dedicating the new military personnel building to Lieutenant Robert F. Taylor, USN, who had been killed in 1969 while on an operational mission off the

⁴ATFL-TPC-O, memo, subj: S-3 Input to the 1990 Annual Historical Summary, 5 Apr 91; Globe (31 May 90 and 28 Aug 90). See also ATFL-TPC, memo, subj: Troop Command Soldierization Program, 5 Mar 90, included in the briefing book for GEN Foss, 7 Mar 90.

⁵Globe (31 May 90), 9.

coast of North Korea. In November the detachment even erected the institute's first-ever yardarm outside its billets.⁶

Marine Corps Detachment

During FY 1990, 207 Marine Corps students began training at DLIFLC, only 5 percent of the total. These students nevertheless made quite an impression. One of them, Corporal Jeffrey J. Khoury, USMC, was named the Outstanding Young Citizen by the Monterey Peninsula Jaycees for his community service. The Marine Corps Detachment (which dropped the word "administrative" from its title in March 1990) started the year with a new commander, Major Richard Monreal, USMC, who was selected for promotion to lieutenant colonel later that spring. His detachment passed a short-notice inspection by the USMC Inspector General in February.

Conclusion

The new steps toward enhancing the role of the student soon began to pay off in improved proficiency. The partnership between the troop units and the academic departments was strengthened during the year. Much of this involved removing distractors, such as rescheduling physical training to the afternoon. The troop units also redoubled their efforts to make a positive contribution to language learning. By most measures these initiatives were having an effect. The institute was producing military linguists more proficient than ever before, and their successors promised to do even better. But there was still much room for improvement.

⁶Naval Security Group Detachment Monterey, memo, subj: Command History 1990, 13 Mar 91.

⁷Globe (18 Jun 90), 19; Marine Corps Detachment, memo, subj: Command Chronology CY 1990, 14 Mar 91.

Chapter Five
Supporting the
Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
in 1990

Sustaining the students, faculty, and staff of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) in the first year of the new decade presented major challenges to the institute's support staff. To this was added after August 1990 the extra burden of supporting Desert Shield. Once again the staff made invaluable contributions to mission accomplishment while laying the groundwork for future gains.

The overall management of non-academic support functions in 1990 fell to three men, the chief of staff, school secretary, and garrison commander. The chief of staff was Captain John A. Moore, USN, who had assumed his job in the fall of 1988. Colonel Vladimir Sobichevsky began the year as school secretary. He left in March and was replaced by Colonel William K.S. Olds. The garrison commander, while not on the institute staff, was nevertheless a key player.

Garrison

The garrison commander and the rest of the Fort Ord staff provided a variety of essential services. For the first half of the year Lieutenant Colonel Gerald Stratton held the position. He was replaced in August by Lieutenant Colonel William L. Moore. During 1990 they established tighter control over Fort Ord staff elements providing support to the institute. All activities on post under the Directorate of Personnel and Community Activities were consolidated into a new Presidio of Monterey Community and Family Activities Division to oversee the child development center, the Price Fitness Center, the recreation center, the post library, the NCO/EM club, and Youth Services. In September Harry Keeler, the long-time Presidio of Monterey engineer, retired and was replaced by Philip Rubino, who took control over all mechanics working on post. Many of these and other supporting activities were continuing to adapt to better support the personnel on post.¹

Facilities engineering was a complex and demanding set of responsibilities. The physical plant on post stretched from barracks constructed in 1902 to the most modern classroom and special-purpose buildings and included some 2.7 million square feet of building space, up 78% in just five years. On the one

¹AFZW-DC-PM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1990, 18 Mar 91.

hand the facilities engineers had to take care of sewers and redwood conduits that were over eighty years old. During 1990 the post's sewer system was given a thorough inspection and repair to stem a recent spate of breaks. On the other hand the institute was laying plans to install a fiber optic cable system to network its growing number of desktop computers. The maintenance of the existing buildings and grounds took up a great deal of time, and work on the grounds was restricted by the continued drought. As the closure of Fort Ord moved closer to reality the institute became increasingly aware of how dependent it was upon base operations support.²

Facilities Management

While the 1980s saw a surge of new construction on the presidio, the first year of the new decade saw a shift towards upgrading older facilities. The only new construction initiated by the Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, during 1990 was a 68-room barracks building in the Russian Village. This was initially delayed by a DoD-wide moratorium on new construction, and a few months after work finally began the contractor declared bankruptcy, leaving the project unfinished. Requests for several more projects to complete the 1983 master plan, including an academic auditorium, audiovisual building, print plant, outdoor athletic complex, and a third new academic facility, lost out in the competition for shrinking military construction dollars. The Board of Visitors lamented the loss, declaring bluntly that "existing dilapidated facilities are detrimental to effective learning and teaching."³

The Facilities Management office under Jerry Abeyta instead poured over \$1.1 million of mission money into improving existing facilities. The former headquarters building (Bldg. 277)

²For an initial estimate of the institute's requirements for base operation support in the event of the complete closure of Fort Ord, which ranged from 90 to 180 personnel, see ATFL-SS, info paper, subj: Base Operation Support Realignment, 6 Mar 90, and ATFL-SS, info paper, Base Operation Support & Jurisdiction Presidio of Monterey, 5 Mar 90, both included as tabs to briefing book for GEN Foss, 7 Mar 90.

³Report of the Third Meeting of the Defense Language Institute Board of Visitors, 22-23 August 1990, 4. An article critical of the institute's construction program appeared in the *Washington Times* in March.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1990

was given an extensive renovation to house the Information Management directorate, Area Studies, and the Language Program Coordination Office. The bowling alley (Bldg. 222) was converted into office space to house the Nonresident Training Division, then occupying leased off-campus facilities in Pacific Grove. The offices of Local 1263 of the National Federation of Federal Employees were renovated (Bldg. 272) and an arms room was constructed (Bldg. 263) to support the Troop Command soldierization program. Long-delayed work to the roofs and heating systems of several twenty-five year old buildings in the 630 area was completed and nearly twenty windows were installed in Bldg. 634 to improve the working environment. Attractive modern signs and landscaping were placed at two post entrances to replace faded wooden signs.

These extensive efforts to maintain and upgrade existing facilities paid off in the annual TRADOC Community of Excellence competition in June when DLIFLC won the TRADOC Commander's Award for Excellence over all other TRADOC schools, as well as best military personnel center, best barracks, and best overall appearance.

Civilian Personnel Management

Managing the civilian workforce of over a thousand employees was yet another major challenge during 1990, made more difficult by a DoD-wide hiring freeze, the transition to two new management systems, deteriorating service from the supporting payroll office, the threat of a furlough, a major change to the retirement system, and of course, Desert Shield.

A variety of offices was involved in the managing of the civilian personnel workforce at the institute, but the Civilian Personnel Office had primary responsibility. Brian F. Brummer, the Civilian Personnel Officer, left in February after one year, and was replaced by Robert S. Snow, who had also preceded him.

No major changes were made in the status of civilian employees at DLIFLC during the year. The January 1990 pay raise bill contained an eight percent locality pay raise for federal

⁴ATFL-SS, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Account, 23 Apr 91. For a detailed summary of the construction program, see Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III (Jan 91), Tab II-18.

⁵ATFL-CP, memo, subj: Calendar Year 1990 Input to the DLIFLC Annual Historical Summary, 1 May 91.

employees in the San Francisco area, but this did not include the Presidio of Monterey. A version of the New Personnel System, originally proposed in 1986, was finally introduced into Congress in August as HR 5276 by Representative Leon E. Panetta, in whose district DLIFLC was located and who was a member of the institute's Board of Visitors, but it died in committee at the end of the year. Of more immediate impact was TRADOC's decision over the summer to permit a second instructor on each six-person teaching team to be promoted from GS-9 to GS-11.⁶

Much of the day-to-day work was managing civilian employees fell to the staff of the Civilian Personnel Office, who were divided into several sections: Recruitment and Placement, Technical Services, Training, Position Management and Classification, and Management-Employee Relations. These specialists tackled a number of complex problems during the year that defy easy characterization. They implemented ACPERS, the Automated Civilian Personnel Management Information System, under the leadership of Nancy Ramos, who was named TRADOC Personnel Systems Manager of the Quarter for 1st Quarter FY 1991. Together with the Resource Management staff they prepared for the implementation of MCB, Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget, at the outset of FY 1991. They handled several reductions-in-force, including one involving four employees in the Italian Department, and dealt with the aftermath of the 1989 closure of ten low-density language departments, which was still in litigation during 1990. They delivered an extensive variety of training programs, including a newly installed satellite receiver system, under the leadership of Margaret T. Bennett, who was named Woman of the Year by the DLIFLC Federal Womens Program. They made plans for a threatened furlough when Congress and the White House had trouble reaching agreement on the FY 1991 budget. They helped eligible employees to decide whether they should take lump-sum retirement benefits before this option was eliminated at the end of the year. They worked to resolve the numerous headaches caused by staffing problems at the Fort Ord Finance and Accounting Office.

Recruiting was more challenging than usual due to the DoD-wide hiring freeze imposed in January. Requirements in some languages continued to grow, and the provost sought to hold to the staffing ratio gains of recent years in others. As a result the Civilian Personnel Office fought for exemptions to the

⁶For a comparison of other pay reform bills under consideration during 1990 see *Civilian Personnel News*, Special Bulletin, "Pay Reform Issues" (June 1990).

Supporting DLIFLC in 1990

hiring freeze to support training for the On-Site Inspection Agency and other requirements. When Desert Shield forced an expansion of Arabic training, the institute had to go through the same cumbersome exemption request process to hire additional Arabic instructors.

The union-management relationship remained good in 1990, helped along by a union-management task force which began meeting in February. That fall the four-year-old contract was renegotiated with only minor changes. Colonel Cowger later remarked that "a much more cooperative and productive" relationship had developed compared to when he first became involved in negotiations with the union in 1987. Two smaller faculty groups were less successful in their efforts to bargain with the institute's leadership. A handful of instructors dissatisfied with the leadership of the National Federation of Federal Employees, Local 1263 (representing primarily the GS-9 instructors), failed in an attempt to organize a rival local of the American Federation of Teachers, and the Federal Managers Association (representing generally GS-11 and GS-12 supervisors and chairpersons) dissolved itself after more than a decade of existence.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Office, while independent of the Civilian Personnel Office, continued to make its special contribution to the management of the institute's culturally diverse staff under the leadership of F. Kathryne Burwell. The office monitored many aspects of the personnel management system and worked to resolve the occasional discrimination complaint. Burwell also supervised several special emphasis programs and some fifty collateral-duty EEO counsellors.

Resource Management

An equally important set of programs was administered by the Directorate of Resource Management under the leadership of

⁷ Negotiated Agreement Between Defense Language Institute, Presidio of Monterey, CA, and National Federation of Federal Employees, Local 1263, 18 Jan 91 (signed 2 Nov 90); Cowger interview, 10 Jul 91. FMA Chapter 107, letter to Congressman Panetta, 20 Sep 90, and letter to FMA national headquarters, 20 Sep 90.

⁸ ATFL-EEO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1990, 27 Mar 91; and DLIFLC, Multi-Year Affirmative Action Employment Program Plan: 1991 Accomplishment Report and 1992 Update (11 Feb 91).

Lieutenant Colonel Randy R. Beckman, promoted to that grade on March 1. When Beckman was reassigned in the spring, the senior management analyst, John Estep filled in until the arrival of Lieutenant Colonel Matthew H. Fleumer in August. Within the two divisions, management and budget, a variety of programs were administered, such as the Internal Management Control System, Commercial Activities, SPIRIT (Systematic Productivity Improvement Review in TRADOC), STARS (Standard Time and Reporting System), and the travel program, and a steady stream of key management documents were published, including the DLIFLC Master Plan, **A Strategy for Excellence**; the **Quarterly Review and Analysis**; DLIFLC Memo 10-1, Organization and Functions; and numerous budget reports.

The overall level of resourcing held steady for FY 1990 at 1,181 workyears and \$50.1 million. The budget program had two aspects, external and internal. Externally, the Resource Management staff worked with TRADOC and the Department of the Army staff to hold on a fair share of resources for the current year and to compete for resources for the outyears. As the institute came to serve a more diverse set of customers outside the Defense Foreign Language Program, its funding became more diversified. In one case, a \$3.5 million special appropriation for the Monterey Institute of International Studies, DLIFLC was simply administering the grant for Congress. Internally they retained an open budget process that allocated funds through a series of periodic Resource Advisory Subcommittee and Resource Advisory Committee meetings. In October 1990 the process was decentralized even further when MCB, or Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget, was introduced that gave managers down to the level of deans unprecedented flexibility.¹⁰

The Force Management Branch continued to managing the institute's evolving table of distribution and allowances and succeeded in effecting major changes in the staffing standards

⁹ ATFL-RM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1990, 23 Apr 91.

¹⁰ See ATFL-RMB, Fiscal Year 1990 Cost Review (6 Feb 91); DLIFLC Command Operating Budget Fiscal Year 1991 (1 Jun 90); and the minutes of the periodic RASC and RAC meetings.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1990

for instructors based on a visit in February by representatives of the TRADOC Management Engineering Activity.¹¹

Beginning in August the Resource Management staff had to work long hours to ensure the resources would be there to support the institute's efforts to support Desert Shield. During the rest of the year they tracked Desert Shield-related expenses closely.

Information Management

During 1990 the institute continued to inch its way towards the information age using the 1988 Information Systems Plan (ISP) as a road map. But a number of obstacles dogged its path. Colonel Cowger, who chaired the original ISP study group, expressed some of this frustration when he called the institute "twenty years behind" in how it provided essential information to key managers. During 1990 a Department of Defense-imposed cap on purchases of automatic data processing equipment restricted the institute to procuring less than half of what it had purchased in the boom years of 1988-89. Furthermore, the Army-wide move to consolidate information management functions wherever possible hung like a black cloud over the institute, whose requirements were quite different from those of nearby Fort Ord. Within the institute, David Shoemaker, the director of Information Management, was only partially successful in his attempts to implement his concept for a new approach to managing the diverse information mission area disciplines. Although his draft DLIFLC Memorandum 25-1, Information Resources Management Program, failed to win command approval, his mission statement in the DLIFLC organization and functions manual was broadened in scope.¹²

Nevertheless much progress took place. A small team of programmers worked for months to transfer administrative and academic data off the ten-year-old Harris mainframe. The IBM

¹¹ATFL-RM, info paper, subj: Joint TRAMEA/DCST Manpower Assistance Visit, 5 Mar 90, included as Tab E in GEN Foss briefing book, 7 Mar 90.

¹²Cowger interview, 10 Jul 91; ATFL-IM, memo, subj: 1990 Information Management History, 9 May 91; Master Plan, Strategies for Excellence, Parts I-III (Jan 91), Tabs II-21A, B, & C; DLIFLC Memo 10-1 (17 Sep 90), para. 6.2. For info papers on the ADP cap, single DOIM exemption, LAN, and print plant consolidation, see GEN Foss briefing book, 7 Mar 90, tabs I thru L.

4361 acquired the previous year had severely limited memory capacity (12 megabytes), so the programmers opted to transfer much of the data to desktop computers in anticipation of a distributed database. The linchpin of such a system, the local area network, was gradually guided over all the various funding hurdles, and the fiber optic cable and other necessary components were ordered by the end of the year. The number of managers at DLIFLC served by the Army's standard electronic mail system, PROFS, grew from eight to fifty-five during the year.

Shoemaker and his principal assistant, Lieutenant Colonel William Durham, spent most of their time during the year handling the more pressing day-to-day problems that just would not wait. The institute was still suffering the growing pains of absorbing several hundred desktop computers in a two-year time span. Training and user support became more time-consuming and the types of software applications expanded rapidly. The first computer virus hit several computers that fall, but fortunately did no damage.

Several other information management areas saw significant change during the year. For example, the contract for forty-four copiers was switched to Pitney-Bowes for an projected annual savings of \$74,000.¹³ But Desert Shield brought the print plant and the Production Control Office into the limelight as never before. For several years Shoemaker had been fighting to retain institute control over its own print plant, arguing that the unique requirements for printing foreign language instructional material made it unwise to surrender that capability to a larger entity that might have other priorities.

Desert Shield made the print plant virtually the lead agency for DLIFLC's support to deploying units. Existing stocks of Arabic language training materials were rapidly exhausted, and more was printed or contracted out as rapidly as possible. The print plant manager, Michael Southard, and Les Turpin, chief of the Production Coordination Office, worked feverishly to fill orders as they came in. By December they had printed 1.6 million pages in-house and had contracted for another eleven million pages in direct support of Desert Shield. Several more workers had to be hired in the print plant and textbook warehouse to handle the extra load. It was once again made clear that the institute needed to have a responsive, in-house printing capability.

¹³"New Copiers: Headache or Blessing?" *Globe* (5 Feb 90), 12.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1990

In the midst of the build-up Information Management experienced a changing of the guard. Shoemaker, having completed his doctorate in education earlier in the year, resigned in October after four years as director to take a position with Monterey Peninsula College. He was replaced in the interim by the chief of the automation division, Frank McReynolds.

Public Affairs Office

The Public Affairs Office continued to provide a wide range of media relations, community relations, and command information during 1990. In the spring Major Skip Hebert was reassigned, and he was replaced for several months by Captain Joseph Burlas while a civilian public affairs officer could be recruited. The institute's biweekly newspaper, the *Globe*, under the editorship of Kay Rodrigues, won a TRADOC award for excellence in the fall. In December James F. Davis III was named as the first civilian public affairs officer the institute had had in many years.¹⁴

Protocol Office

The Protocol Office continued to handle a stream of visitors, including three or four flag officers a month, throughout the year under the leadership of Pierrette J. Harter. Harter arranged several major events such as the annual meeting of the General Officer Steering Committee in January and the Board of Visitors in August.¹⁵

Command Historian

During 1990 the command historian supplemented his work on the annual command histories in several ways. In the spring he presented a research paper on the origins of the institute in 1941-42 to the Conference of Army Historians in Washington, DC, and in the fall he wrote a history of the institute's Korean language programs for the Korean Curriculum Review. He published the DLIFLC 1988 Annual Command History in October and

¹⁴ATFL-PAO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1990, 16 May 91.

¹⁵ATFL-PRO, memo, subj: Protocol Office 1990 Annual Historical Report, 15 Mar 91.

during the initial months of Desert Shield collected materials on the institute's response.¹⁶

Administrative Support Division

The Administrative Support Division under Captain David A. Donathan continued to provide general administrative support to the command group and staff. In November he was shifted to the Nonresident Training Division and was replaced by Captain Robin Kehler. The Military Personnel Branch (MILPO) continued its excellent personnel service support to Army students and permanent party, winning the "Best MILPO in TRADOC" award for 1990.¹⁷

Security Management

The Security Office entered 1990 under the leadership of James Woodruff. In the spring he published a revised DLIFLC Regulation 380-1, DLIFLC Security Program (26 Mar 90). Later in the year he left the institute and was replaced in the interim by Captain Ann Lew.¹⁸

Inspector General

During the year the office of the Inspector General (IG) continued to handle the steady workload of providing assistance, resolving complaints, and provide other support to the commandant and staff. Lieutenant Colonel Douglas F. Clark and his NCOIC, Master Sergeant Dillard, launched several new initiatives. In addition to several special studies, the commandant directed that the IG and the Evaluation Division cooperate in developing an organizational inspection program that would enable him to periodically look at the entire institute. In July the office also began a longitudinal study of a single

¹⁶"Training Military Linguists for the Pacific War, 1941-42" (March 1990); and "A History of the Korean Language Program at the Defense Language Institute" (October 1990). The former is forthcoming in spring 1992 in a US Army Center of Military History anthology on US Army preparations for World War II. The latter was published in a revised version in *Dialog on Learning Korean*, II (1991 [Jan 92]), 155-68.

¹⁷ATFL-SS, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Account, 23 Apr 91.

¹⁸ATFL-SS, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Account, 23 Apr 91.

Supporting DLIFLC in 1990

class of students from initial orientation to graduation as a novel method of examining the institute's academic programs and administrative support operations from the student's perspective.¹⁹

Logistics

The Logistics Division also experienced a changing of the guard in the spring of the year when Fred Koch, the division chief, and Dave Curran, the property book officer, both retired. For several months Major Gregory Robinson was assigned as the acting chief of logistics. By the end of the year the new chief of logistics was Ralph Brooks and the property book officer was Gaye Gandia. The logistics standard operating procedures manual was republished in the fall and the new Army Standard Intermediate-Level Management System was installed to enable the division to interface directly with supporting logistics systems at Fort Ord.²⁰

Budget limitations held the procurement of supplies and equipment down sharply compared to the previous year, especially in big-ticket items such as furniture and computer equipment. But all projections were thrown out in August when Desert Shield forced the institute to take extraordinary measures to support deploying linguists. The division won exemptions to the hiring freeze to hire several more warehouse workers.

Audio-Visual

During 1990 The Source AV, Inc., continued to provide comprehensive audiovisual services to the institute under contract at a cost of \$808,000 for FY 1990.²¹ The contractors responded superbly to the increased requirements of supporting Desert Shield, which caused them to exceed its ceiling for tape duplication and called upon them to provide rapid service in establishing the new video teletraining facilities. Alan M.

¹⁹ATFL-IG, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1990, 7 Feb 91. The new organizational inspection program was formally announced by DLIFLC Memo 20-1, Organizational Inspection Program, 1 Jul 91.

²⁰ATFL-SS, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Account, 23 Apr 91.

²¹ATFL-SS, memo, subj: 1990 Historical Account, 23 Apr 91.

Merriman continued to serve as chief of the DLIFLC Audio-Visual Management Office.

Conclusion

Supporting DLIFLC proved to be a challenging task in 1990. The support staff rose to that challenge and accomplished the diverse missions that came their way. Desert Shield showed them clearly that business-as-usual was no longer an option, that the institute needed excellence in its support operations just as much as it needed academic excellence. This meant better staff coordination, more flexibility, and better planning. The ultimate lesson of Desert Shield for the support staff was that the extraordinary levels of support in all areas that the institute's staff generated during the second half of the year was now the baseline from which all future operations would be measured. They reached further than they thought they could, and in the future would have to reach even further.

Glossary

| | |
|---------|--|
| ACPERS | Army Civilian Personnel System |
| ACTFL | American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages |
| ARCENT | US Army, Central Command |
| ATC | Air Training Command |
| ATRRS | Army Training Requirements and Resources System |
| BILC | Bureau for International Language Coordination |
| CALICO | Computer-Assisted Language Learning & Instruction Consortium |
| COPE | Cultural Orientation Program for Egypt |
| CPO | Civilian Personnel Office |
| CTS | Cryptologic Training System |
| D'ECOLE | Defense Executive Committee on Language Efforts |
| DFLP | Defense Foreign Language Program |
| DIA | Defense Intelligence Agency |
| DLAB | Defense Language Aptitude Battery |
| DLI | Defense Language Institute |
| DLIFLC | Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center |
| DLPT | Defense Language Proficiency Test |
| DoD | Department of Defense |
| EEO | Equal Employment Opportunity |
| EIDS | Electronic Information Delivery System |
| EM | Enlisted Men |
| FAO | Foreign Area Officer |
| FLO | Final Learning Objective |
| FLTCE | Foreign Language Training Center, Europe |
| FSI | Foreign Service Institute |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GITS | General Intelligence Training System |
| GOSC | General Officer Steering Committee |
| HR | House Resolution |
| ILR | Interagency Language Roundtable |
| INF | Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces |
| ISP | Information Systems Plan |
| MATFL | Master of Arts in the Teaching of Foreign Languages |
| MCB | Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget |
| MLI | Military Language Instructor |
| MOLINK | Moscow-Washington Communications Link |
| MOS | Military Occupational Speciality |
| NCO | Noncommissioned Officer |
| NFFE | National Federation of Federal Employees |
| NSA | National Security Agency |
| ODCSINT | Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (Army) |
| ODCSOPS | Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Planning (Army) |
| OPD | Operations, Plans, and Doctrine |

| | |
|--------|--|
| OSIA | On-Site Inspection Agency |
| PERT | Program Evaluation, Research, and Testing |
| PIC | Proficiency Improvement Course |
| PROFS | Professional Office System |
| RIF | Reduction-in-Force |
| SCOLA | Satellite Communications for Learning |
| SMDR | Structure Manning Decision Review |
| SOF | Special Operations Forces |
| SOQ:IE | Student Opinion Questionnaire: Instructional Effectiveness |
| SOQ:PE | Student Opinion Questionnaire: Program Effectiveness |
| TRADOC | US Army Training and Doctrine Command |
| TRAMEA | TRADOC Management Engineering Activity |
| USA | US Army |
| USAF | US Air Force |
| USMC | US Marine Corps |
| USN | US Navy |
| VTT | Video Teletraining |

Document List

1. DFLP General Officer Steering Committee (briefing book)(25 Jan 90).
2. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 25 Jan 90 (8 Mar 90).
3. DFLP General Officer Steering Committee (briefing book)(17 May 90).
4. DAMO-TRO, msg, subj: May 1990 Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), 031235Z Jul 90.
5. Report of the Third Meeting of the Defense Language Institute Board of Visitors, 22-23 Aug 90.
6. DLIFLC Recapitulation of Student Input for FY 1990 (Standardized Student Record System [SSRS])(printout 17 Oct 90).
7. DLIFLC Annual Program Review 1991 (covering FY 1990)(no date).
8. DLIFLC BILC 1990 National Report (Jun 90).
9. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, Organization and Functions, 17 Sep 90.
10. DLIFLC Directory (Apr 90).
11. DLIFLC Master Plan: Strategies for Excellence (Jan 90), Vol. 1 (Parts I-III) and Vol. 2 (Part IV).
12. DLIFLC Master Plan: A Strategy for Excellence (Jul 90), Vol. 1 (Parts I-III) and Vol. 2 (Part IV).
13. DLIFLC Fiscal Year 1990 Cost Review (6 Feb 91).
14. Negotiated Agreement between Defense Language Institute, Presidio of Monterey, CA, and National Federation of Federal Employees, Local 1263 (18 Jan 91).
15. Terrance M. Ford (LTC, USA). **The Adequacy of the Army's Foreign Language Program.** Carlisle Barracks, PA: US Army War College, Study Project, 1 Feb 90.
16. Bramble, William J., and David L. Hosley, eds. **Improving Foreign Language Teaching through Technology.** Conference Proceedings, 29-30 Oct 90. Orlando, FL: Institute for Simulation and Training, Mar 91.

Note: Copies of the above listed documents are available in a separate volume in the office of the command historian.

Index

- Abeyta, Jerry J, 47
Academic Records, 33
ACTFL, 3
Administrative Support, 55
Air Force, 7, 44
Aiso Library, 33, 40
Arabic, 1, 6, 8-12, 18-23,
24, 31-32, 34, 37, 43,
50, 53
ARCENT, 10, 20
Area Studies, 33, 39-40, 48
Armbrust, Peter J, 26
Audiovisual Management, 56-57
Babcock, Chaplain (MAJ) John,
40
Beckman, LTC Randy R, 51
Bennett, Margaret T, 49
Betts, Maj Bruce, 44
Board of Visitors, 17, 47,
49, 54
Boylan, Dr Patricia, 27, 31
Brainerd, LtCol Helen, 32
Brendel, Dr Gerd, 36
Brooks, Ralph, 56
Broz, James J, Jr, 40
Brummer, Brian F, 48
BILC, 3, 5
Burlas, CPT Joseph, 54
Burwell, F Kathryne, 50
CALICO, 3
Cashel, LtCol William, 30
Cervone, LtCol Daniel, 31
Chang, Dr Namgui, 30
Chee, William, 30
Chinese, 29, 35
Clark, LTC Douglas F, 55
Clark, Dr John LD, 32-33
Clausen, Scott, 33
Clifford, Dr Ray T, 4n, 15,
24-25, 33
Cole, Charles, 30
Command Group, 14
Connelly, LTC Donald B, 43
Contracts, 5, 17-18, 20
Counternarcotics require-
ments, 6
Cowger, Col Ronald I, 15, 50,
52
CPO, 19, 39, 48-50
Cryptologic requirements, 4,
34, 26
Curran, Dave, 56
Curriculum, 37, 39
Customs Service, 6
Czech, 4, 11, 29, 36
Daniels, TSgt Doug, 21
Davis, James F III, 54
DCSINT, 11
DCSOPS, 1, 7
DEA, 6, 34
D'ECOLE, 38
DeLaSelva, Ben, 19, 31
Desert Owl, 11
DIA, 1-2, 5
Dillard, MSG, 55
Donathan, CPT David A, 55
Durham, LTC William, 53
Dutch, 27
Educational Technology, 14,
16, 24-32, 34, 35, 37,
38, 39
EEO, 50
XVIII Airborne Corps, 8-9, 19
Eschrich, MAJ John, 28
Estep, John, 51
Evaluation, 25, 34
Executive Agent, 1-3, 17
Facilities Management, 47-48
Faculty & Staff, 25, 39
FAO, 6, 7, 29, 39-40
FBI, 6
I Corps, 9-10, 38, 42
Fischer, COL Donald C, Jr,
4n, 10, 14-22, 33, 42-43
Fleumer, LTC Matthew H, 51
FLTCE, 10, 36
FMA, 27, 50
FLOs, 26
Ford, LTC Terrance M, 2n,
13-14
Fort Ord, 18, 38, 46-47, 49,
52, 56
Frazier, Ani, 27, 31
French, 6, 27, 36

Index

- FSI, 17
Funke, Dr Maurice, 29
Gandia, Gaye, 56
Gargiulo, Ted, 40
German, 3, 4, 8, 11, 31
Golphenee, LTC Jack, 32
Goodfellow AFB, 8, 34
GOSC, 1-4, 13, 25, 42, 54
Granoien, Dr, Neil F, 39
Grant, Luba, 28
Greek, 32
Harter, Pierrette, J, 54
Hebert, MAJ Skip, 54
Hebrew, 32
Herzog, Dr Martha, 33
Higgins, CWO Robert, 21
Hooshmand, Dr Dariush, 33
Horn, Claire, 40
Hunter, MAJ Claude E, 30
Ich, Dr Vu Tam, 32
Iglesias, Mario, 27
ILR, 3
Information Management, 48,
52-54
INS, 6
Italian, 27, 49
Japanese, 30, 34
Johnson, LTC Terry D, 39
Kallu, Joseph, 21
Keeler, Harry, 46
Kehler, CPT Robin, 55
Keller, BG Richard F, 4, 10n,
20, 23
Khalil, Alfie, 17
Khoury, CPT Jeffrey J, 45
Koch, Fred, 56
Korean, 30, 54
Kozumplik, LTC Peter W, 5n,
17-18, 20
Kraemer, LCDR Kent H, 44
Kwon, Joe, 30
LaJoie, BG Roland, 2
Lasagna, John B, 16
Le, Ba-Nhon, 33
Leaver, Betty Lou, 29
Lee, Alice K, 30
Lehowicz, BG Larry G, 1-4
Lesser, LTC Harry K, Jr, 43
Lett, Dr John, 34-35
Lew, CPT Ann, 55
Logistics, 56
LPCO, 21, 48
Macintosh, 25, 34, 38, 39
McNaughton, Dr James C, 54
McReynolds, Frank, 54
Magno, LTC Richard A, 19,
32-33
Marine Corps, 7, 20, 43, 44,
45
Mein, W Carey, 27
Merriman, Alan M, 57
MLIs, 23, 25-26
Monreal, Maj Richard, 45
Moore, Capt John A, 15, 46
Moore, LTC William L, 46
Navy, 7, 15, 43, 44-45
Neff, John, 34-35
NFFE, 17, 48, 50
Nieman, Joshua, 17
Nonresident Training, 33,
35-37, 48, 55
NPS, 17
NSA, 1-3, 4, 26, 38, 44
Nuño, Maj Bernardo, 20, 27
Oldenburg, LTC William, 33
Olds, COL William KS, 15, 18,
46
Olney, Dave, 29
OPD, 33
Operation Desert Owl, 11
Operation Just Cause, 2
OSIA, 2, 5, 27-28, 50
Outerbridge, LTC Sandy, 2
Panama, 1, 2, 13, 21, 26
Panetta, Leon E, 17, 49
PCO, 18
Persian-Farsi, 21, 30
PERT, 32-35
Polish, 4, 31, 36
Portuguese, 27
Print Plant, 53
Program Management, 33, 40
Protocol, 54
Public Affairs Office, 54

Index

Ramos, Nancy, 49
Reed, Whitney E, 2, 4
Registrar, 33
Research, 35, 42
Reserve Components, 6-7, 9,
20, 23, 33
Resident Training, 40-41
Resource Management, 16,
50-52
Richardson, LtCol Sharon, 38
Roberts, Dr Clive, 36
Robinson, MAJ Gregory L, 27,
31, 56
Rodrigues, Kay, 54
Romanian, 34
Rubino, Philip, 46
Russian, 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 15,
18, 27-29, 36
Security Management, 55
Shannon, John W, 10n, 20, 23
Shoemaker, Dr David F, 52-54
Snow, Robert S, 48
Sobichevsky, COL Vladimir,
15, 46
Soudakoff, Stephen, 18
Source AV, 56
Southard, Michael, 53
Spanish, 6, 8, 26-27, 36
Special Operations Forces,
2-3, 6, 37
Stratton, LTC Gerald, 46
Synn, Frank S, 30
Taba Tabai, Dr Mahmood, 33,
37
Tagalog, 30, 34
Talmy, Vladimir, 18
Taylor, LT Robert F, 44
Testing, 24, 33-34
Thai, 30
311th MI Battalion, 9, 18
TRADOC, 2, 9, 15, 16, 36, 48,
51-52, 54, 55
Troop Command, 43-44, 48
Turkish, 32, 34
Turpin, Les, 53
Vietnamese, 30
Vorobiov, Dr Alex, 28
VTT, 7, 9, 18-19, 23, 32, 36
Walter, Gary D, 40
Webster, LtCol Russell W, 33
Wilson, Craig L, 17
Wise, LTC James C, 39
Woodruff, James, 55
Yonan, Joe, 36

