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Defense Language Institute Foreign Language
Center Board of Visitors (BoV) Meeting
30 June/1 July 2020

Tuesday, 30 June 2020

8:00 am – 8:15 am   Call to Order
Dr. William Whobrey, BoV Chair

Administrative Business (Review of DLIFLC Mission & Vision Statement, BoV Operating Procedures)
Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

8:15 am – 9:15 am   DLIFLC Mission Brief

1. Presenter: Mr. Steven Collins, Chief of Staff, DLIFLC
   Attendees:
2. COL Gary M. Hausman, Commandant, DLIFLC
3. Col Stephanie R. Kelley, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
4. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Provost, DLIFLC
5. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

9:15 am – 9:30 am   Break

9:30 am – 11:30 am   Introduction of Topic: DLIFLC Mission Focus

1. Presenter: COL Gary M. Hausman, Commandant, DLIFLC
   Attendees:
2. Col Stephanie R. Kelley, Assistant Commandant, DLIFLC
3. Mr. Steven Collins, Chief of Staff, DLIFLC
4. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Provost, DLIFLC
5. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

11:30 am – 12:00 pm   Lunch

12:00 pm – 1:00 pm   Focus Area: Directorate of Undergraduate Education (UGE)

1. Presenter: Dr. Hiam Kanbar, Associate Provost, UGE
   Attendees:
2. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Provost, DLIFLC
3. Dr. Deanna Tovar, Assistant Provost, UGE
4. Dr. Janette Edwards, Dean, Asian School 1
5. Dr. Mina Lee, Dean, Asian School 2
6. Dr. Hyekyung Sung-Frear, Dean, European & Latin American School
7. Dr. Atousa Mirzaei, Dean, Middle East School 1
8. Dr. Tatjana McCaw, Dean, Middle East School 2
9. Dr. Viktoria Shevchenko, Dean, Middle East School 3
10. Dr. Ali Goldoust, Dean, Multi-Language School
11. Dr. Johnathan Gajdos, Dean, Persian-Farsi School
12. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

1:00 pm – 1:45 pm Classroom Observations
(Various schools, exact classes TBD)

1:45 pm – 2:00 pm Adjournment
Dr. William Whobrey, Chair

Wednesday, 1 July 2020

8:00 am – 9:00 am Focus Area: Directorate of Educational Technology (ETD)

1. Presenter: Dr. Parandeh Kia, Associate Provost, ETD
   Attendees:
2. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Provost, DLIFLC
3. Mr. Joemer Ta-Ala, Assistant Provost, ETD
4. Ms. Mirtha Justiniano-Galley, Director, Curriculum Support
5. Dr. Grazyna Dudney, Director, Faculty Development Support
6. Mr. Kurt Kuss, Director, Aiso Library
7. Dr. Branka Sarac, Director, Technology Integration
8. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

9:00 am – 9:15 am Break

9:15 am – 10:15 am Focus Area: Directorate of Continuing Education (CE)

1. Presenter: Mr. Mike Vezilich, Associate Provost, CE
   Attendees:
2. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Provost, DLIFLC
3. Dr. Ra’ed Qasem, Assistant Provost, CE
4. Dr. Ali Afshar, Dean, Distance Learning
5. Ms. Bella Kelly, Dean, Extension Programs
6. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

10:15 am – 10:30 am Break

10:30 pm – 11:30 pm Focus Area: Directorate of Language Proficiency Assessment (LPAD)
1. Presenter: Mr. Kalman Weinfeld, Director, LPAD
   Attendees:
2. Dr. Robert Savukinas, Provost, DLIFLC
3. Dr. Pradyumna Amatya, Associate Director, LPAD
4. Dr. Gerd Brendel, Director, Proficiency Standards
5. Dr. Seamus Rogan, Director, Test Production & Analytics/Design
6. Dr. Chung-Yao Kao, Director, Test Architecture
7. Mr. Steve Solomon, Director, Test Review & Education
8. Ms. Maribel Johai, Director, Test Management
9. Mr. Detlev Kesten, ADFO

11:30 am – 12:00 pm     Wrap Up and Adjournment
                      Dr. William Whobrey, Chair
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Dr. Gunther Mueller (BrigGen, USAF Ret.)
Dr. Jim Keagle (COL, USA, Ret.)
Dr. Bernard Loeffke, (MG, USA, Ret.)
Ambassador (Ret.) Dell Dailey (MG, USA, Ret.)
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June 30, 2020

WELCOME REMARKS  
Mr. Detlev Kesten, Assistant Provost for Academic Support welcomed all in attendance.

CALL TO ORDER  
Dr. Whobrey welcomed the three new board members, and expanded on what is expected from BoV meetings. He called the meeting to order at 0815.

BoV ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS  
Since the meeting was held in the M.S. Teams virtual platform, Mr. Kesten explained Team’s etiquette while raising any questions or comments and participating in discussions during the meeting. He also expressed his gratitude to BoV members reading and acknowledging ethics brief as well as operating procedures and how the board is run from an operational perspective. Mr. Kesten encouraged the Board to give their constructive feedback on improvement of the meetings and how the data is presented.

DLIFLC MISSION BRIEF  
Before getting into the mission brief, DLIFLC’s Provost, Dr. Savukinas, welcomed and thanked the Board for their perseverance throughout the nomination process and for their continued interest. One point that he highlighted, was that the meeting was an administrative meeting this time. He stated that the follow up meetings will have a focus area and that the observations will be forwarded to the Parent Committee (The Army Education Advisory Committee). DLIFLC is a subcommittee of the AEAC. AEAC reviews the observations and decides whether to endorse or ask questions for clarification. Once approved, those become actionable items and are sent back to the DLI Commandant for further action.  
Afterwards, Mr. Steven Collins provided an overview of DLI mission. He stated that teachers in DLIFLC come from almost 100 different countries and that 97% to 98% are native speakers of
the languages they teach. They come here with different expectations and different ideas about what we are all here to do. The Dynamic and Revolutionary Learning Environment chart, which was created three years ago, helps us all stay on track. At the bottom of the pillar, are the components such as standards and discipline, trainings and EEO that empower our students to achieve the 2+/2+/2 goal. As we go up the pillars, students are the main effort supported by curriculum and faculty to get to 3/3 and beyond at some point in future. The current requirement of graduation is 2/2/1+, but the goal is 2+/2+/2. We try to challenge our students and faculty to see how we can do things more productively in learning the language. He added that DLI has the authority to confer Associate of Arts Degree to graduates that pass the course and fulfill other educational requirements. DLIFLC is working towards granting a Bachelor of Arts Degree which was in the House Version of National Defense Authorization Act last year but the Senate did not agree on the language so it was pulled out. It is in the House Version again this year and we are hoping that we are granted the opportunity to confer Bachelor of Arts Degree for our graduates. Mr. Collins stated that at any one time we have 2,500 multi-service students here at DLI Monterey, 99% of whom are high school graduates. 84% of the students will support intelligence missions. Since 2002, 16,000 students have been awarded AA degrees. He added that DLI has about 17,00 faculty, 80% of which have advanced degrees. We have a tremendous in-house faculty training program. New faculty members are required to go through one-month mandatory training, even if they are experienced foreign language teachers. This is because our pedagogy and methodology are different. We also offer a limited support for the teachers who want to earn their advanced degrees such as MA and doctoral studies as long as the courses that they are taking are germane to their current job. Mr. Collins also discussed how the O/CONUS immersion program is not as robust as it used to be in the past. The budget cuts and Covid-19 have affected the number of immersions offered to students. We have one local immersion facility in Ord Military Community and another small building here on Presidio that recently Mr. Kesten and his team have rededicated to do ISO immersion activities. He stated that the students who go on O/CONUS immersions, gain confidence in the language, they get to stretch their capabilities and their speaking proficiency also improves. DLI is working on the issues “are the immersions worth the bang for the buck”. This is something that the Provost has gone through a lot of analysis on to see if it is worth the time and effort. Ambassador Dell Daily expressed that immersion is a very valuable way to learn a language. He believes that immersions boost confidence in students, meanwhile, he requested to discuss the immersion funding process in further details to see if the Board could influence the system based on their potential connections. In response to this question, Mr. Collins stated that DLI has commissioned a number of studies with a local analysis group known as Trac Monterey as well as the Air Force Statistics Squadron to take a look at the results and see if DLI is getting a good level of proficiency from the money and efforts that we are spending in. He mentioned that the Commandant will discuss the issue in more details later during his presentation.

Mr. Collins also talked about the presence of DLI employees worldwide based on the requirement that necessitates having full-time teachers in different locations. DLI efforts are scalable both in terms of the number of teachers and the type of mission conducted. For instance, in Hawaii, there are over 30 faculty teaching higher level language requirements for the National Security Agency while at SouthCom lower level proficiency language familiarization is taught.
INTRODUCTION OF TOPIC: DLIFLC MISSION FOCUS

COL Gary M. Hausman stated that since the middle of March 2020 over 97% of employees are teleworking here at DLI. He added that Covid-19 rates continue to increase since Memorial Day in Monterey County. The main concern is Salinas because of the migrant population and a lot of workers who come and work here live in very close quarters. As it is the prime agriculture season and the Presidio is within 30 miles of this area. While Covid-19 cases are growing in the area, DLI is doing extremely well. There have been only two cases of Covid-19 so far. As far as the students are concerned, we are prepared to take precautionary measures if we had an outbreak. We have a vacant Barracks facility which can be used as an isolation of quarantine facility if needed. We have a robust testing and tracing capability but luckily, we didn’t have to use that. As the Covid-19 came upon us, a lot of Chinese faculty were home for the lunar year celebration. We started isolating faculty members who were returning from overseas as early as in January. Covid-19 started hitting us hard on immersions. Initially students, who were on immersion in South Korea and Taiwan, were pulled back before we had to put them in 14-day isolation due to the fear of contracting the virus. Students were back to DLI while the traditional classroom instruction was still ongoing. Then, due to outbreaks in Europe, we had to bring students back from France and then South America as well. In March 2020, the faculty were instructed to transition to virtual training within a week of notice. The transition took place without taking a day off and 3 months later we are still conducting the language training virtually. The main question about virtual training is how it affects higher proficiency rates. Is it better than face-to-face training? We think that virtual training is sufficient for maintaining our current proficiency level but there will be dips when it comes to higher proficiency standards, which is 2+/2+/2. According to the data collected here in DLI from graduation and scoring rates in the past 90 days, we are maintaining the current proficiency rates, but we see a dip in 2+/2+/2 rates. We have also observed that category one languages like French and Spanish are sloping a little downwards compared to category four languages. The length of the course could be contributing to this trend. While category one courses are 9 months long, category 4 courses are 16 months long.

The Army is responsible for foreign language instruction at DLIFLC. DLIELC, which is located on San Antonio, is run by the Air Force. Here in DLIFLC we teach based on what the services need including Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard and any military spouses on a space available basis. At DLIELC, English is taught to our foreign partners. Given that 80% of DLIFLC students will be cryptologic linguists, NSA is very much interested in what we do. Once a year, Col Hausman, as the DLI Commandant, briefs the DLI annual program review and the last brief was in Dec 2019.

Col Hausman also discussed the issue of moving up DLI graduation rate from the current standard of 2/2/1+ to 2+/2+/2, or 3/3, which is required by NSA. In 2005, it was decided that DLI will increase graduation rates of the students from its current standard to 2+/2+/2 gradually by 2023. At current standard of 2/2/1+ DLI is on target. Taking admin and academic attrition rate into consideration, our goal is to graduate above 64% and currently we are maintaining the 69% graduation rate. Last year was the first time we had some students graduating at the rate of 2+/2+/2, which indicates that we are making progress but to be there by changing the standard by 2021 we are not on track. We are at 36% graduation rate moving towards 2+/2+/2. Dr. Whobrey asked if the 36% graduation achievement meant that certain languages or even certain faculty are more on the right trajectory than others. In response to this question, Col Hausman expressed that is actually the case, and that some programs are doing better than others. For example,
Chinese is at 50% while Arabic, where we teach different dialects, is at 27%. Hebrew is a very small program and it is at 82%. There are a lot of factors that have role in this discrepancy. Some of the factors come down to the education of the faculty, some factors are the standardization of the tests, some of it is the curriculum, some of it is the size of the program as well as the caliber of the students who arrive here in DLI. But the one factor that the Commandant believes that DLI has not invested in is time. However, the services can’t easily afford allocating more time to language training. DLI helps students in achieving higher proficiency post-graduation as well. But achieving 3/3 within 9 months is not realistic. DLI is under pressure to meet the new standards. If we are to get to 2+/2+/2 proficiency rate by 2023, then we will have 60% attrition rate which would mean having fewer linguists. Thus, Col Hausman has proposed keeping students post DLPT for more language training in order to reach to 2+/2+/2 level. To implement this, DLI will need more teachers, more space for students to stay longer which will result in an increase in the budget estimated at an additional 8 million dollars a year.

COL Hausman then discussed the challenges that the DLI budget is faced with. In 2020 and 2021, DLI budget is under scrutiny to save costs. Currently, Col Hausman has CAC and Army staff advocating for DLI that it hasn’t been funded adequately and by 2023 we are projected to be short by 40 million dollars. He also has raised this issue with his chain of command. Ambassador Dailey posed a question the State Department’s approach. Could they be an example that DLI would follow and emulate? COL Hausman expressed that we assess that DLI Washington better achieves than what the State Department does for DoD linguists. State Department’s language instruction is tailored more for its own employees. The State Department relies on a-year spent in the target language country after graduation as an academic training while in the Army they are two separate parts. DLI and State Department probably don’t collaborate enough to make sure government is not spending on one element versus another. But the reality is we both predominantly use those same four contract companies for our language training. Over the last two years, DLI arranged a pilot training where we sent some Army FAO’s to the FSI training instead of Washington training. This was done for a few reasons; to see if the training in the State Department was better compared to the Washington, to be in class with other State Department Officials and to give them more flexibility to do more professional development opportunities. We have since stopped our Army FAO pilot because they weren’t training towards DLI proficiency test, which is the DoD measure of the ILR scale. Some of those FAOs were not graduating at the level that DLI wanted them to. Also, it was more expensive to do the training through FSI.

Dr. Keagle asked if there were any proponents in the process advocating for the use of technology instead of training as many linguists as being suggested. COL Hausman expressed that discussions about technology use continue. There is USDI proponent and ODNI proponent that are pushing the technology piece. NSA and ODNI have been putting a lot of money in Human Language Translation (HLT) to see if they can get things working. While Google Translate is further ahead, we are not at a point where we think that technology is ready to replace the human mind and translation. The culture aspect is a big part of a language, which is why we have a diverse faculty. The impact of religion is also important, where students can understand how men and women interact in the other parts of the world.

COL Hausman added that he had a discussion with General Lundy on how DLI is using its resources and if it is using them effectively. The conversation came down to the study abroad immersion programs are a value added. Immersions cost DLI about 4 to 5 million dollars a year, depending on how many students are sent abroad. Some surveys and studies done in the past...
show that immersions are value added. We collected a lot of data from the past few years and we came to a conclusion that immersion programs are worth the resources. COL Hausman also recognizes that there is value to have an outside organization look at DLI data and make recommendations. As per General Lundy’s approval, DLI reached out to Trac Monterey to look at certain topics and give us an external non-biased opinion. Trac Monterey did their research on what criteria stands out that would contribute to 2+/2+/2. The findings from Trac Monterey showed that there is correlation between a student’s GPA and how they do in DLPT test. They also confirmed that one of DLI’s linguist entrance test is the best measure to tell whether a student will be successful at 2+/2+/2. There are so many variables contributing to the success of the students that other small ones start becoming washed out. They couldn’t show a direct correlation between other variables and the students’ achievements. Trac Monterey also looked at post-DLPT training and decided that it is a good use of money. When they looked at the immersion program, on the other hand, they concluded that immersions are not value added. They found out that the students who were going on immersion already had higher GPAs compared to the students who didn’t get to participate in the immersions. DLI maintains that immersions help with motivation and confidence which are the non-tangible things that cannot necessarily be measured in students’ scores. So now there is discussion about whether the immersion budget should be used towards post-DLPT.

In response to Dr. Keagle’s question about the length of the post-DLPT program, COL Hausman answered that post-DLPT trainings last from 10 to 12 months. Trac Monterey has also confirmed that the above amount of time has resulted in achieving the desired outcome. Post-DLPT trainings are conducted to get students to 2/2/1+. We are not keeping students for 2+/2+/2, but 15% of the students not only get to 2/2/1+, they actually reach 2+/2+/2 after attending post-DLPT trainings. COL Hausman also added that students are sent to OCONUS immersions when they are between end of the 2nd semester and beginning of 3rd semester because this is the point where they have obtained adequate proficiency to read, listen and speak, but are not too far along where they start focusing on DLPT test. During OCONUS immersions, students stay overseas for four weeks. They get immersed in the environment, however, for security reasons, we won’t have them stay at local homes. They get to study the target language for 8 hours a day with other international students in class. We predominantly send students who are academically doing better to motivate them not to be satisfied with 2/2/1+ but to get them to 2+/2+/2 or higher. Dr. Keagle discussed his own experience with immersions and talked about how participating in immersions can help students to learn the target language in a different environment more effectively. COL Hausman added that non-tangible aspects of immersion programs make it value added. Since scientific studies do not show direct correlation between students’ success and the immersions they participate in, he realizes that he is in the middle when it comes to being for or against immersions.

Dr. Whobrey expressed that he was in charge of study abroad and language immersions for ten years. He realizes that a lot of aspects of immersions are anecdotal, but some aren’t in terms of seeing actual results from students who come back. Whether or not an immersion is value added actually has to do with whether you are testing the value that is added which is often psychological. We agree that DLPT doesn’t test that added value from immersions. He added that the value added by immersion is there and it is testable. It is just the matter of figuring out how to test that. He also discussed that the research done by Trac Monterey is useful to some extent, but we have to be cautious about the results. Thus, it is difficult to determine the value
added unless we send 100% of the students. Then we will have a real data set. He said that he
would question the conclusions because we don’t have a real data set.
COL Hausman expressed that the goal was to send 80% of the students to immersions but that
the 10% budget cut on TDYs affected immersions negatively. When in January 2019 the
guidance came out from the Secretary of the Army to cut 10% on TDYs, that guidance was
interpreted by staffs in a way that was harmful for our immersions. In October, November and
December 2018, we were at an historic high on immersions and were planning to send 30% to
40% of our students to immersions for upcoming months when we were asked to stop TDY’s we
had already spent all the budget. It was later determined that the budget cut wasn’t targeted
towards the immersions and that it was exempt from any cuts. At that point, we had civilian pay
raise coming into effect and we had to use our funds to cover those costs. The issue of budget
cuts became a high-profile topic when an article was released in the Foreign Policy Magazine in
April of last year. The title: The DoD cuts on immersions in DLI are designed to save money for
the border wall. He added that immersions will continue to be a hot topic and that he would have
to get guidance on that from DoD level.
COL Hausman discussed the transition to virtual teaching during Covid-19 and how DLI was
successful in finding solutions to two major challenges. The first one was screen fatigue where
students receive 6 or 7 hours of virtual language training. He instructed the faculty to utilize
different classroom activities than what they would use in the traditional classroom setting. For
instance, assigning students off-screen readings, have them do research and prepare presentations
then share with the rest of the class. The teachers had that latitude to be creative and lessen
screen time for students. The second challenge we faced was how do we measure the students’
performance as we go forward. Most of our quizzes and tests were in paper and pencil. We are
still working to tackle this challenge. We gave the teachers the autonomy to use alternative
assessment models. For instance, assigning students research projects or administering speaking
tests instead. However, we don’t want to rely on alternative way of testing, we need to
standardize out assessments and get back to our traditional type of quizzes and tests. Trac
Monterey confirmed that our curriculum and assessment tools were the best means to track our
students’ success. He added that his concern would be that a student might have a GPA of 3
using these alternative assessment tests, but seeing them score 1/1/1 on DLPT test. We realize
that these alternative mechanisms are not as good a correlation as our traditional assessments.
Thus, the guidance given to the teams was to convert the paper and pencil assessments into
digital format. The teachers and curriculum departments are collaborating to digitize our
assessments. We have been investing in UCAT, originally designed for teachers to utilize it in
their teaching. Now we are working to use UCAT for administering digitized assessments. While
it is not risk proof, we do have some control over the tests. He also added that he thinks that we
are on the right track on this issue and that this is the major message that we have been having
for the last four weeks.
Dr. Whobrey asked about how we think that the faculty, staff and leadership at DLI will be able
to look at the lessons learned when the Covid-19 is over. Will we be able to take unemotional
look at what happened and if any of that should be continued and used to make our teaching and
learning more effective in the future? In answer to this question, Dr. Savukinas stated that we are
aware that the virtual teaching environment is not ideal. By the end of July, we will have 16
classes that have gone through a full semester under the Covid-19 environment. He added that
his intent was to analyze in-course proficiency tests of these 16 classes and compare that with the
pre-Covid-19 tests in the same language program. In terms of lessons learned, we had National
Cryptological School reached out to DLI asking a series of questions which we are planning to address on the 16th of July. Questions posed by NCS included: How did you manage online instructions? What were the lessons learned? Furthermore, we had our training analysis division do a survey of students as well as faculty in the MS Teams environment. In terms of faculty development, MS Teams has enabled to reach a larger number that we have never attained before in any type of faculty development training event. We have recorded these trainings to repurpose, repackage, revisit and recycle. We went from how to login to this platform to how to be a better language teacher in virtual environment.

Col Kelley expressed that language learning is very subjective and everybody has a different experience. Our challenge is to manage the issues to our best of ability. We are trying to turn out the standardized product when the input is not standardized. So, any kind of advice and assistance that we can get in doing that is much appreciated.

COL Hausman also discussed the topic of testing and said that the testing component is a big deal because DLI builds, refreshes and does quality control on the tests and DoD uses them to measure the linguists’ proficiency level. The DLAB test, which is the initial test that a recruit takes to identify whether they will be a good linguist or not hasn’t been updated in probably 20 years. We are doing a pilot with the Navy where we are bringing in sailors that have not taken DLAB test. We are relying on their ASVAB scores to see if we can measure a student’s potential to be a good linguist without taking the DLAB. The main test is our Defense Language Proficiency test and there is branches to that. The future is computer adaptive testing, or CAT. We have used CAT testing format with our Spanish language. We have been asked by DoD to convert our DLPT tests to this CAT format. The next language that we will be working on will be Chinese. He added that the next major testing piece is that reading and listening are assessed by DLPT. On the other hand, OPI only measures a student’s speaking proficiency, not listening. We have a request from DoD and it is a requirement for us to build a two skill OPI test. It is one test that measure both speaking and listening proficiencies. However, the problem is that we don’t have the resources to build that new test. Those are some of the challenges that are going on in testing arena.

FOCUS AREA: DIRECTORATE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION (UGE)
Dr. Kanbar and UGE team members introduced themselves to the Board of Visitors. She stated that there are eight schools that provide basic intermediate and advance language training to service members. Transitioning to virtual instruction overnight is one of the challenges that we have been faced with since mid-March. In order to make the transition smooth, we provided MS Teams training to our faculty, we sought input from our teachers, MLIs, staff and students in particular on a daily basis. This way we were able to bring some improvements in the process. Dr. Whobrey inquired about what are the schools and the Deans thinking in terms of capturing lessons learned. What have the schools done? He added that this could be a terrific research project. Dr. Kanbar expressed that virtual environment has helped our students become more autonomous learners. It has also helped us conduct more one-on-one language instruction sessions without having to worry about shortage of space. We have been able to reach out to a larger number of students at the same time. She added that DLI is conducting formative assessments in all shapes and forms and evaluating the situation to see what worked and what went wrong. Dr. Shevchenko stated that in addition to soliciting feedback from the schools, they also conduct sharing sessions where they learn from each other within and across the schools. For instance, the biggest challenge that we faced while providing language instructions to
beginners in a virtual environment was teaching sounds and script. We started doing post sound and script lessons learned. The team that was the first to prepare for the situation, shared their experiences, challenges and suggestions about how things can be done differently with the rest of the school. Dr. Edwards discussed that she was impressed to see how at UAA the shift turned out so quickly from technical know-how to quality of teaching itself. This has become a recurring theme. Our in-house trainings are devoted entirely to virtual quality of instructions and the kinds of activities that can be done. She added that echoing what Dr. Kanbar mentioned before virtual environment has also opened up new possibilities for exploring alternative assessments, particularly in the form of project-based assessments. Dr. Lee added that UGE has been working with ETD to convert the paper and pencil standardized tests into digitized UCAT format for all schools.

Dr. McCaw discussed that after initial excitement phase where 65% of students reported the they liked virtual training, they started complaining about screen fatigue. Meanwhile, some students reported their stress level at seven on a scale of zero to ten. Thus, the teachers started using more creative ways to maintain students’ motivation level. For example, students were assigned independent research projects to work off screen. Some departments started blogs. Teachers added more fun activities such as scavenger hunt to their classroom instructions and increased the number of mini-immersions to keep students focused.

Dr. Tovar discussed that following COL Hausman’s command guidance on developing a more flexible curriculum that would assist students get to 2+/2+/2 level, the language curriculum teams came together and did an assessment of strengths and weaknesses of each of the seven languages. These languages include Korean, Chinese, Russian, Levantine, Iraqi Egyptian - the three MSA Arabic dialect programs – and Persian Farsi, as well as French, Spanish and Hebrew. All of the projects are on track to be completed by 30th September 2020. Dr. Johnathan stated that in October 2019, Persian-Farsi school started using the new curriculum and that they had a couple third semester students graduating with the new curriculum. They are making significant improvements. The curriculum team is now working on first draft of revisions. In October and November 2020, we will have our first group of students graduating with the new entire curriculum arc.

Dr. Davis inquired if the virtual curriculum was different than the traditional classroom curriculum. Dr. Tovar expressed that all the various mentioned curriculua are developed in a platform that can easily transition to a virtual environment. They are designed to go both ways. Some are more ready in terms of how virtually oriented they maybe. We recently had a training on eBooks and Book Widgets. Our team members are learning how to develop a curriculum from scratch that is virtual. Dr. Whobrey asked if UGE will be using more project-based assessments, where it is more focused on show me by doing rather than remembering. Dr. Kanbar expressed that at the beginner level the curriculum needs to be more guided as student don’t have any language knowledge. Subsequently, we will increase student’s autonomy and gradually the role of the teachers will diminish as we go up to third semester. She also added that project-based training encourages team work, relying on resources outside the curriculum and gives the students autonomy. Dr. Kanbar discussed that the challenge that we are facing is with culture whether it virtually or in classroom instruction. In the reading and listening descriptors cultural aspects of the language is very minimal in the first two semesters, with significant increases in the third semester. Currently, we are working with the curriculum team to include culture and merge the descriptors of culture with those of reading and listening starting at ILR
level 0+. There are three phases of learning a culture that we are considering to spiral in our curriculum: recognition, introduction and knowledge.

**ADJOURMANENT**

Dr. Whobrey adjourned the meeting at 2:00pm

---

**July 1st, 2020**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Dr. Whobrey called the meeting to order at 8:00am. Mr. Kesten welcomed the Board and DLI team members to the second day of the meeting.

**FOCUS AREA: DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT (ETD)**

After a brief introduction of the ETD and Board members, Dr. Kia expressed that ETD is an academic support division which was set up exactly a year ago. There are six divisions within the organization including curriculum support, technology integration, LTEA, student service learning, AIS0 library and faculty development. She added that we have 19 online learning products that are used widely. There are two areas that ETD has focused its efforts on, which are creation of cross functional teams and development of the most effective possible resources in order to provide best products, services and practices to various teaching environments. She stated that ETD is proponent of deployment and usage of technology to support language acquisition and enhancement in order to achieve DLI mission of 2+/2+/2 and beyond. They are proponents of establishing and maintaining current curriculum standards and support, faculty development and support and certification, instructional design, instructional technology and student service learning. Dr. Kia also expressed that the overnight transition from traditional classroom instruction to virtual instruction has been a success.

Dr. Ta-Ala discussed that ETD created two teams including an Office 365 Training Team and a Strategies for Virtual Teaching Task Force. In the beginning, Office 365 Training Team provided training and support to our faculty on MS Teams. After receiving students’ feedback and complains about screen fatigue and increase in stress level, we switched gears and provided support to students as well. We decided to mitigate screen fatigue and impact of virtual teaching and give students some tips on how to cope with anxiety and fatigue during those training sessions.

He added that one of their biggest hits is best practices open mic where faculty send out invitation to other faculty members to share their best practices as to what worked and what didn’t during virtual instruction. Dr. Ta-Ala added that Strategies for Virtual Teaching Task Force is a cross functional team composed of members from ETD, CE and UGE got together and created training for faculty members across DLI and LTDs locally and abroad. If there is one thing that Covid-19 brought to us is the realization that we can work as a team together cross functionally and right now we have created a thriving eLearning community. Dr. Dudney stated that TRADOC regulation 350-70 provides regulatory guidelines on what is required of teachers before they teach a class independently. Currently, we are planning on revising the existing courses and adding new ones in a blended format. Some courses, such as e-certification, are under design right now. Dr. Sarac discussed how to access online eLearning products and
resources on DLI website. Dr. Kia stated that one of biggest challenges that ETD is faced with especially in 2 or 3 years ahead is shortage of resources and manning. We have quite a few unauthorized positions within the division in the directorate that need to be addressed. Ambassador Davis posed a question regarding recertification process and if it was easy for the teachers to take the time and get recertified. Dr. Kia expressed that timing is not an issue for the teachers. The recertification course is a one-week training and the faculty have showed their interest in refreshing their knowledge through this course. Dr. Dudney expressed that we are planning to shift to encompassing a model where the teachers build their own portfolio based on specific criteria participate their activities and document their professional development while working with specific competencies and there also will be a course that they have to take. It is going to be an iterative process where teachers monitor their professional development trajectory. Dr. Whobrey inquired about language assessment.

Dr. Kia stated that after this meeting we have a call with NSA about sharing our products. They have access to our Teams environment. She also added that we have been in contact with other institutes like West Point that is also using Office 365 for almost everything, not just teaching. We are seeking to identify best practices that are out there. Dr. Ta-Ala expressed that he has worked closely with on an LMS task force project and that he is connecting with academia in Washington DC. All the vendors in DC are using platforms like Canvas. Ambassador Daily asked if the students get any type of government issued equipment after they join DLI and what is the level of sophistication and quality of this equipment compared to what they might get in a private public university? Dr. Kia expressed that all students and faculty receive a technology bundle which includes a MacBook Pro, iPad, and other pieces that go with it. This is the key reason enabling everyone to work from home during this pandemic. We have some Apps like VMWare that enable the users to access learning and teaching materials remotely when needed. Recently, COL Hausman has allowed students who are unable to leave after they graduate to hold on to their devices. This has created a little bit of shortage of equipment for the newcomers.

FOCUS AREA: DIRECTORATE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION (CE)

After a brief introduction of CE and Board members, Mr. Vezilich and his team members discussed their mission, main activities and some of the challenges and issues that CE is faced with. Mr. Vezilich stated that CE has lost one of its schools and now it’s down to three schools. The newest addition is the reintegration of the Command Language Program into CE. He discussed that Extension Program (EP) is the largest program in CE. EP works closely with NCS and our eight LTDs are co-located with NCS. EP is primarily focused on DLI graduates who will become cryptologic language analysts. We provide a variety of 4-6 week and 19-week intermediate and advanced courses to help them maintain their proficiency. In the last year, we have embarked on intermediate and advanced courses and it is where most of our attention lies for a couple of reasons. The 19-week courses are parallel to the courses offered at the Presidio of Monterey in UGE schools at intermediate and advanced levels. We have an ongoing project of coordination and synchronization between our two directorate to keep us in line with the accreditation standards we need to fulfill the requirements for the upper division college credit that we have been awarding our students this year. Students receive 33 upper division college credit that can be applied into other degree programs. This is a very high visibility area for DLI and also for students in terms of incentive and motivation. He also added that EP is facing some challenges including hiring, tech support and professional development opportunities. Dr.
Whobrey inquired about the new LTD in Vilseck and what language is being taught there. Ms. Kelly expressed that they used to teach African dialect but recently they changed it to Egyptian dialect. Currently, four languages, including Russian, French, Egyptian and Persian-Faris are taught in Vilseck.

Mr. Vezilich discussed that Field Support program primarily works with non-linguist services members that need the language to perform their job better. This is where we have focused our support to various Special Operations units. We offer accelerated and mini-basic courses that are 20-24 weeks long and learning outcomes are usually at level 1 or 1+. He also mentioned the challenges faced by FS. One of the challenges was shutting some LTDs which resulted in losing faculty members. Other challenges include budgetary constraints and loss of personnel authorizations that have affected some of the smaller programs.

Ambassador Daily asked if the decline has been visible in the Special Operations Forces. Dr. Qasem expressed that currently SW doesn’t receive any language trainings as they shut down the San Diego, Colorado and Norfolk locations. The number of students has been steady because the language has become part of the pipeline training.

Mr. Vezilich then discussed that Distance Learning program is focused on service members, primarily DLI graduates who are seeking to sustain and enhance their language skills and don’t have the opportunity to come to Monterey to attend intermediate or advance courses. When the resident program moved to DLI under UGE schools, we did retain DETRA program. DETRA is placed under our DL Program. It is a 47-week course and it is credited. Mr. Vezilich added that the online program which is called BLTS program has been in existence for 15 years. There is no dedicated budget for this program so we don’t have dedicated teachers working all the time. Usually, MTT teachers cover the online classes when they are not on the road. He added that transitioning to virtual instruction was less of a challenge for CE instructors compared to the teachers who had never administered online teaching. We have been recording our lessons learned and best practices to share across the institute. Due to Covid-19 we have converted 25% of our MTT programs to virtual instruction courses. Students are receiving full credit for these courses. This has been our main achievement during this pandemic time.

Dr. Whobrey asked if service units request BLTS and if CE does have the resources to support the program, what would CE do that they can’t do now? Mr. Vezilich responded that BLTS was established to meet the needs of the linguists in the Field who can’t get the training as residents. Our approach has always been long term maintenance as opposed to intensive daily courses. Usually a student’s waits no more than 3 to 4 weeks to get into class. FAOs are expected to get to certain proficiency levels over the course of their careers which requires some programming. Currently, we are able to support 17 languages and sometimes we have to borrow teachers. We are successful at what we are doing. We have strong instructional design, good technical support and teacher training to perform our job.

**FOCUS AREA: DIRECTORATE OF LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY ASSESSMENT (LPAD)**

After a brief introduction of the team members, Mr. Weinfeld discussed that the fact that the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) system is the only test authorized for assessing an individual’s proficiency in a foreign language, making it a high-stakes test. He added that LPAD’s mission is to develop and maintain proficiency assessments that meet or exceed reliability and validity standards. Mr. Weinfeld expressed that he works neither for schools in DLI nor for the Provost. He works for the Assistant Commandant, so there is no conflict of
interest between testing organization and teaching organization. They also have a division that analyzes and reports the student survey results. These surveys are confidential and if they see any red flags, we inform the Command group and the management for further actions. He added that OPI tests an individual’s ability to speak in a foreign language. While some perceive OPI as an interactional test, it really is an interview test. At LPAD, they prioritize the testing languages based on strategic language list, agency, service interest, examinee value, age of the test and other components like it. Mr. Weinfeld stated that the eight key languages that they pay special attention to and that have to do with National Defense Strategy languages include Chinese, Russian, Korean, Persian-Farsi, French, Urdu, Pashto and Arabic. He also mentioned that they are not given the information about who is taking the test, whether it is a BLTS student or someone whose unit thinks it would be interesting for them to take the test. NSA does not disclose the number of people who are required to take the test versus people who just take the test for other reasons. For example, the language that is tested the most is Spanish. 15,000 people take the test per year, and it is very unlikely that all of those are BLTS. He further discussed that LPAD has a strong IT infrastructure so that they track and test items that they buy. They contract out most of our development products, even though it is more expensive than using our internal resources. In the past DLI, used teachers to develop assessment tests, which puts everyone in a difficult situation in terms of tests getting compromised. He added that the main challenge that they face is keeping the deployed assessments updated. A typical test has two linear forms and they have a total of 150 tests. The life of a test here in DLI is determined to be 8 years. Another key challenge is the reference criteria for the test which is Inter-agency Language Round Table (ILR). On the website, given the description of each level it says “…illustrate, but do not exhaustively describe, either the skills or situations in which he/she may function effectively.” Another challenge is the assessment score reliability especially at lower levels. They developed a Very Low range test, but users don’t want to take a test twice. Taking the test at a lower range like 0+ to get up to 1+ or 2+ level needs more than what the service units are willing to invest. Dr. Whobrey inquired as to whether the DLPT tests to ILR level 3, so how do they test to levels 4 and 5? Mr. Weinfeld expressed that we develop tests specifically for levels 3 and 4. We don’t go above level 4. We have upper range tests for Greek, Japanese, Persian-Farsi. Primarily the upper range tests developed based on the stakeholders’ request and some of them were created based on internal needs. For instance, the Greek and Japanese projects were initiated by internal need to preserve some of the SMEs when there was a decrease in the number of the students. In order to keep certain SMEs in the language, they started Greek and Japanese DLPT 5. Dr. Whobrey asked a follow up question on how a native speaker gets rated to level 5? Mr. Weinfeld stated that there are efforts going on to adjust the descriptors of ILR and the first change was to remove native speaker. Ambassador Dailey asked that with conventional war up to 9/11 and then combating terrorism post 9/11 until now, has the number of testing increased, has there been any trends in demand for more testing worthy of note? Are there any trends that will help us reinforce the need for language training in this new era? Mr. Weinfeld discussed that he thinks that the number of people being tested has to do with money rather than need. There is no trend associated with pre or post 9/11 operations. For instance, the requirement for two-skill participative OPI test has been requested by special forces. Because this is what they need and this is the kind of test that will demonstrate their operational readiness. While the demand for the two-skilled OPI is increasing, they are not resourced to take action. COL Hausman discussed that we have an allocated budget for testing every year that is not categorized for any language or any particular test. When prioritizing a language, we work with
all DoD and we recommend the priorities then DLNSEO validates our requests. This is how we
decide whether to refresh the test in a language and add what is necessary. Due to the budget
constraints we have assumed risk on testing in the past couple of year, but we need to prioritize
testing as we cannot assume risk any more.
Ambassador Davis inquired if language pay is just given to harder languages? And how it was
decided? Mr. Weinfeld stated that the policy decision was enforced by the services and that it is
not based on the most critical languages. Dr. Whobrey asked if the FLIP pay was based on the
difficulty of the language. Mr. Weinfeld discussed that the pay amount is not wholly based on
need, for instance, Arabic is rewarded based on being a critical language. On the other hand,
French linguists are rewarded higher pays as well. COL Hausman added that there is a lot of
discussion in DoD to change our pay system. He also mentioned that first requirement is that a
student needs to be proficient in two modalities. When it comes to pay, there are some
restrictions on Army side. There is a max cap that a student can reach. Currently, there is no
bonus awarded for a higher proficiency level, but the discussion about giving more money for 3s
than 2s is an on-going issue. DoD is directing us to award 3s a higher pay, but they are not going
to give the services more money in totality. The services agree with giving more money for
higher levels of proficiency, but not necessarily at the risk of not paying those who score at level
2.
Dr. Savukinas reiterated that DLI is currently an AA degree granting institution and has been
working for a good number of years on becoming a BA degree granting institution. NSA and
Army are interested in DLI’s initiative and the key drivers of that interest are recruitment and
retention of services members and also to promote more proficient linguists as they advance to
their career. DLI has received approvals from the accrediting commission. We have also mapped
out degree program for 120 credits. 75 of those credits come from intermediate and advance
language courses and 42 credits from Gen Eds transfer. Last year, Congressman Jimmy Pennetta
supported the DLI Improvement Act and it made it to the House, but the Senate didn’t approve
the language. We were basically asking for an amendment from AA degree to confer a BA
degree. We have got all the approvals that we need except for the pending Congressional
legislation.

**ADJOURNMENT**
Dr. Whobrey adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm
TAB C - Subcommittee Members/Mission/Meeting Purpose
Subcommittee/Board Members:

Dr. William Whobrey (COL, USA, Ret.), BoV Chair
Ambassador (Ret.) Ruth Davis, PhD
Dr. Gunther Mueller (BrigGen, USAF Ret.)
Dr. Jim Keagle (Col, USAF, Ret.)
Dr. Bernard Loeffke, (MG, USA, Ret.)
Ambassador (Ret.) Dell Dailey (MG, USA, Ret.)

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

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

Meeting Purpose:
The purpose of the meeting is administrative.
TAB D - Observers and Guests
Guests or Observers present at the 30 June - 1 July 2020 Meeting:

COL Gary M. Hausman, Commandant, DLIFLC
Mr. Steve Collins, Chief of Staff
Dr. Robert Savukinas, Provost
Mr. Detlev Kesten, Associate Provost for Academic Support & ADFO
Service Unit Commanders
One hundred and thirty Faculty & Staff members of DLIFLC
TAB E - Handouts
The BoV Members received briefing documents. The titles below are in order of presentation.

1. Command Brief 30 June 2020
2. Commandant’s Remarks 30 June 2020
3. Undergraduate Education Brief 30 June 2020
4. Educational Technology Brief 1 July 2020
5. CE Mission Brief 1 July 2020
6. Language Profeciancy Assessment Brief 1 July 2020
I hereby certify this 15th day of September 2020 that to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes to be accurate and complete.

Dr. William Whobrey (Chair)