DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER

ANNUAL COMMAND HISTORY

(RCS CSHIS-6 [R3])

1 January - 31 December 1989

by

James C. McNaughton

Command Historian

September 1991

Presidio of Monterey, California

Contents

Table of Contents

Chapter One
The Defense Foreign Language Program
in 1989

The first year of the presidential administration of George Bush was one of the most dramatic on the international scene in the postwar era. After several years of glasnost and perestroika in the Soviet Union under Mikhail Gorbachev, the socialist regimes of Eastern Europe began to give way to the demands of their restless and disillusioned citizens. In March, Soviet citizens voiced their complaints in a contentious election. In May, the Hungarian regime opened its border with Austria to permit Germans from the German Democratic Republic to flee to the West. Popular demands for overthrowing the socialist regimes became irresistible. The Soviets, once the guarantors of socialist stability, stood by impassively as popular pressures mounted in all their former satellites. In November, in a climactic event witnessed by television viewers around the world, the people of East Berlin broke through the hated Berlin Wall, thrown up in 1961 under Soviet guns to seal them off from the West. The wall, once the symbol of a divided Europe and Communist oppression, was transformed into a symbol of hope. The socialist regimes of Eastern Europe were acknowledged as historic failures, and the Cold War was declared over.

For a few months it appeared that events on the other side of the world would parallel those in Eastern Europe. As the world looked on, thousands of Chinese defied their communist rulers to demonstrate in Beijing, culminating a decade of dissent against the heirs of Mao Zedong. In June, the ruling party's leaders chose the path of violent suppression, and Tiananmen Square, ironically named the "Gate of Heavenly Peace," became a synonym for government brutality. Emperor Hirohito, Japan's strongest link with the terrible events of the 1930s and 1940s, passed away. The Communist rulers of Vietnam began to withdraw their troops from Cambodia after ten years of bitter civil war. Americans were reminded of their own tragic involvement in Southeast Asia when Neil Sheehan's controversial biography of senior advisor John Paul Vann, *A Bright, Shining Lie*, won a Pulitzer prize.

Events in the Middle East and Latin America in 1989 demonstrated that the end of the Cold War did not guarantee a new era of global peace. Tensions continued between the US and Libyan leader Muammar al-Qaddafy. In January, US Navy pilots destroyed two Libyan jet fighters over the Mediterranean. In July, Lieutenant Colonel Higgins, USMC, captured in Lebanon while serving on a United Nations peacekeeping mission, was executed by his captors. The Islamic revolution in Iran continued its erratic course. In 1989 when British-Indian author Salmon Rushdie published *The Satanic Verses*, a novel that many devout Muslims considered blasphemous, the aging Iranian cleric Ayatollah Khomeini condemned him to death in absentia, only to die himself a few months later. The eight-year war between

Iran and Iraq had ended in August 1988. During the war's final phase in 1987-88 America had demonstrated its commitment to stability in the region by escorting Kuwaiti oil tankers in the Persian Gulf. During the first year of peace Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein was pondering how to retain his hold on power at home and his self-appointed leadership role among the Arabs. By the end of 1989 he had apparently secretly decided to strike out once again, this time against his wealthy neighbor, Kuwait.

In Latin America in 1989 civil wars continued in Nicaragua and El Salvador. The US "War on Drugs" focused American concerns on the drug-producing countries of the Andes. The strategic country of Panama was in the news almost daily, as General Noriega defied US attempts to remove him from power. Strong economic sanctions imposed by the Bush administration in the spring of 1989 devastated the Panamanian economy, but had no political result. In March, the US sent in additional troops for a show of force. In October, after a failed coup attempt, the Bush administration decided to solve the problem by military action: in December, US Southern Command and the XVIIIth Airborne Corps launched Operation Just Cause to seize control of the country and remove Noriega from power.

These unpredictable global events underscored the continued need for a robust American intelligence community to monitor developments around the world and provide sufficient warning time for American foreign policy decision-makers. "This may be the age of glasnost," as a former US intelligence official recently put it, "but it is also one in which America will need superb intelligence in order to understand, interpret, assess and, where possible, anticipate the changes with which the nation is certain to be buffeted."[1]

The military intelligence agencies of the Department of Defense formed an essential component of this capability. And should deterrence fail, they would give America's fighting forces the winning edge. Although they had long invested in an astonishing variety of sophisticated technical means of gathering intelligence, the need to gather information through human intelligence and interception of voice communications remained undiminished. According to the former official, "No satellite can sense the mood and pulse of a bazaar, a foreign capital, a restless province or of disaffected dissidents."[2] Or, one might add, interrogate a prisoner or train a guerrilla band. Military linguists remained vital to the US intelligence community.

Defense Foreign Language Program

The Department of Defense (DoD) met the requirement for military linguists through the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP). The Secretary of the Army was designated as the executive agent for foreign language training for all four services, and DoD Directive 5160.41, together with the implementing joint service regulation directed the Army to fund and operate a resident language training school and conduct a DoD-wide foreign language testing program.[3] Resident training was conducted by the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC).

Managing such a complex function required detailed coordination. The Director of Training in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (ODCSOPS) was the Army's staff action officer for the executive agent, and he was advised by a joint-service General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC). Each of the four services, two Assistant Secretaries of Defense, plus the National Security Agency (NSA), the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), and the US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) (which had administrative responsibility for the school) had seats on the committee. Each service retained responsibility for personnel management of its linguists, and their major subordinate commands were authorized to operate separate command language programs, subject only to the technical control of DLIFLC.

Several other government forums existed for the exchange of views and the coordination of policy. These included the Defense Executive Committee on Language Efforts (D'ECOLE), the Intelligence Community Staff Foreign Language Committee (ICSFLC), the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR), and NATO's Bureau for International Language Coordination (BILC), but none had the policy-making powers of the GOSC.

During 1989 the General Officer Steering Committee showed remarkable leadership stability. When Brigadier General Larry G. Lehowicz, USA, convened the annual meeting in January 1989, most of the principals and many of their staff officers were well familiar with each other and the issues under discussion. Both Lehowicz and his action officer, Lieutenant Colonel Howard K. "Tip" Hansen, USA, had been appointed in 1987. A number of initiatives had been launched in 1987 and 1988 that had to be pushed and followed through on in 1989. Most of this staff work was handled by the action officers who were in daily contact by telephone and met face-to-face in Washington once a month.

In the spring of 1989 these action officers met for the second annual weekend "team building" workshop in Harpers Ferry, Virginia, to review priorities for the DFLP and improve the ability to work together. One result was an agreement to do a major rewrite of the joint service regulation, published only two years before. This tasking was passed to DLIFLC, but work proceeded slowly.[4] In May, the GOSC held a special meeting in Washington to approve a new "Proficiency Enhancement Plan" developed by DLIFLC (discussed below).

That summer Hansen, Lehowicz's action officer for two years, left to join the faculty of the Army War College. Pending the arrival of his replacement, the director of the DLIFLC Washington Office, Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA, acted as interim replacement. Later that summer Major Sandy Outerbridge, USA, arrived to take up the job and was promoted to lieutenant colonel in September 1989. By the time of the January 1990 annual meeting, the GOSC members could look back with satisfaction upon several years of progress in the DFLP and in the academic programs at DLIFLC.

Fixing the Schoolhouse

Since its inception in 1981 the GOSC had been deeply involved in "fixing the schoolhouse," bringing reforms to DLIFLC, DoD's premier resident foreign language training center. Several of the committee's member agencies, such as the National Security Agency and the US Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, had been involved in the internal operations of the institute for decades. By the late 1980s the institute's senior leaders had enlisted the support of committee members for a broad-front program to upgrade the proficiency of the school's graduates. Included were such measures as developing a new generation of tests, building new facilities, increasing the student-teacher ratio by 40%, forming teaching teams, and overhauling the civilian personnel system. The GOSC generally applauded these initiatives, which often came with a hefty pricetag, because they were visibly connected with rising student proficiency.

Providing adequate resources for DLIFLC was a chronic source of controversy. Actual dollars for the school's operations were passed down from Army through TRADOC, and resource managers at each level had to balance the institute's requirements with many other needs. The institute drew up its multi-year plans based on expectations of a stable level of funding, and this was in turn based upon a stable student load. Yet year-to-year fluctuations in student input and the overall Army training budget made for constant uncertainties.

A budget agreement had been reached in FY 1988 that promised steady resource levels, but at the outset of FY 1989 the institute was still not fully funded. The TRADOC staff pointed to the high staffing ratio at the institute (94% of authorized civilian positions filled) compared to the rest of the command. The DLIFLC staff argued that the institute was unique in its staffing and mission. As usual, several major mission items were submitted to TRADOC as unfinanced requirements, and some special projects were funded by other agencies. The institute was eventually fully funded at $48.3 million, an all-time high, even though civilian workyears declined almost 4% from FY 1988. In fact the institute had to turn back $921,000.[5]

As FY 1990 began, DLIFLC once again had to remain vigilant to ensure that it was given adequate resources by the TRADOC staff to carry out its DoD-wide mission. In the years ahead language training would have a tough time competing with many other requirements for shrinking defense dollars.

One of the more painful decisions that had to be implemented during 1989 was the elimination of the ten smallest language departments, one result of the scrutiny of the institute's funding over the previous two years. In January 1989 the GOSC approved the actions unanimously and the shutdowns began (see Chapter 2).

The search for a new DLIFLC commandant for the institute also occupied the attention of TRADOC and the other members of the GOSC during 1989. Since 1985 two commandants had served less than a full three-year tour. When the second one left in September 1988 the Army launched an

intense search for a qualified replacement with the right mix of academic credentials and proven leadership ability. In the interim the institute was commanded by the assistant commandant, Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF. In the spring, TRADOC selected Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr., USA, a widely experienced logistician. Fischer, then in his second year in command of a division support command in US Army-Europe, was a self-taught speaker of German and a graduate of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. He assumed command of the institute in August 1989 (see Chapter 2).

The GOSC was active in another "schoolhouse" issue during the year, the enforcement of minimum entry standards. For many years the institute had recommended certain minimum scores on the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB) for entry into different categories of languages, but it had no authority to enforce this. In FY 1989, 12% of all incoming Army students did not have the recommended DLAB scores. Analysis of student data showed clearly that students with less than the recommended scores had a much higher attrition rate.[6] In January 1989 the GOSC endorsed a DLIFLC initiative to enforce these minimum admission standards. In return, the institute promised better results if the lower-aptitude students were removed from the pipeline. The services agreed, and with a temporary waiver system to ease the transition, the requirements were gradually put into effect during the year. Similar standards were imposed for admission into intermediate and advanced courses, and standards were also set for entry into follow-on voice-intercept training at the Goodfellow Technical Training Center. At the January 1990 meeting of the GOSC, Lehowicz declared that a "contract [was] in place for the services to provide students capable of learning languages."[7] This policy change contributed to the continued rise in proficiency results.

For several years the institute's civilian provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford, had pointed to rising student proficiency scores as evidence that internal reforms were working. Lehowicz, encouraged by the upward trend, set an ambitious goal for the institute at the January 1989 GOSC meeting: 80% of basic course graduates achieving 2/2, almost double the FY 1988 rate, within four years. He hoped that this "mark on the wall" would encourage the institute to new heights of excellence. The institute responded to the challenge by developing yet another academic master plan, the "Proficiency Enhancement Plan (PEP)."

The plan, presented at a special GOSC meeting in May 1989, combined several initiatives already underway, "the culmination of the significant initiatives made to fix the DLIFLC program: heightened graduation standards, final learning objectives, prerequisites and entry standards, priority of languages, team teaching, and a new personnel system."[8] It explicitly linked the factors of production to the desired outcome and offered an improved "product" in exchange for a resource commitment for such things as the New Personnel System, educational technology, increased course lengths, and faculty development (see Chapter 3).

DLIFLC was also responsible for a comprehensive system of foreign language tests used throughout DoD, the Defense Language Proficiency Tests

(DLPTs). The advent of proficiency pay based on periodic testing, combined with the renewed emphasis on standards in the field, resulted in great attention being focused on the development and fielding of the tests. Someone belatedly discovered during the year that the Army agency responsible for fielding the tests (not DLIFLC) was over a year behind in printing and distribution. The institute worked to help the services solve this problem while concentrating on the development of a new generation of tests, the DLPT IVs (see Chapter 3).[9]

Most GOSC members were confident that the "schoolhouse" was on the road to excellence under progressive leadership. Lehowicz told the other members of the GOSC in May 1989 that the "development and implementation of the DLIFLC PEP represented the last step that needed to be accomplished to 'fix the schoolhouse.'" All agreed that "'the field' is most impressed with the increasing quality and caliber of the DLIFLC product."[10] The DFLP's managers could thus pay more attention to issues in other portions of the DFLP.

Fixing the Linguist Life Cycle

Managing military linguists has never been easy. The training is demanding and lengthy, and the skill can quickly go stale. Personnel managers must contend with dozens of languages and various skill levels, and requirements are not always properly coded on staffing documents. Large numbers of first-term linguists serve only one utilization tour. The last major examination of the Army's system, the Army Linguist Personnel Study, conducted in 1975, resulted in a major revision of Army Regulation 611-6, "Army Linguist Program," published in 1978. But more than a decade later, no one believed that the system had been fixed.

During the 1980s most of the key leaders of the DFLP came to agree that improving the management of military linguists was at least as important as improving the quality of their training. Yet they found the problem unusually stubborn. In January 1990, the Assistant Director for Training for the National Security Agency "expressed his concern over the lack of discernible progress being made toward our stated goal of having a 'linguist life cycle' in each of the services."[11]

The starting point for any management of the linguist life cycle must be the requirements that actually exist in the force structure of today and tomorrow. For several years the GOSC had urged the services to conduct a billet review to verify their actual requirements, and in 1989 this remained at the top of the list of priorities for the DFLP action officers.[12] In May 1989, Lehowicz once again tasked the services to conduct a review, and continued to press the service program managers throughout the year.[13] By January 1990 he still "emphasized the need for everyone to look at the overall military personnel management system for linguists," complaining that "the system moves slowly and works against linguist life cycle development." In frustration he asked "if the personnel system was so tough that we couldn't influence it, and if we needed to go to Congress for legislation."[14] The

executive agent staff officer admitted that the billet review was proving to be "a difficult task," and that the Army and Air Force, the two services with the largest numbers of linguists, had not yet completed their reviews.

The services were more successful in tightening their management of student quotas for training at DLIFLC. Thanks to the full implementation of ATRRS, the Army Training Requirements and Resources System, the number of "empty seats" in language classes dropped to a new low. In May 1989, DLIFLC hosted an ATRRS users conference in an effort to make the system work even better. The overall fill rate, which had fluctuated around 80% for several years, climbed to 96% in FY 1989. This, combined with the elimination of the low-density language departments, caused the number of students per section to climb from 7.0 to 7.8 in just two years.[15] The services continued to press for more training seats, despite the caps accepted by the GOSC in 1988. At the annual Structure Manning Decision Review in June the Army asked for a 31% increase and the Air Force a 58% increase by FY 1992. These increased demands were more than the projected resources could support.[16] Nevertheless the improved fill rate was good news. One GOSC member called it "a very important factor in the executive agent's efforts to keep the budget 'wolf' from DLIFLC's door during the coming fiscal years."[17]

During 1989 it became increasingly clear that great improvements in military language capabilities could be made by paying more attention to personnel management. This new focus also highlighted the fact that linguist requirements were not all cut from the same cloth, even for the same language. Linguist requirements originated from several distinct communities within the services, and each of these sets of requirements was evolving at its own pace.

Cryptologic Requirements

The single largest user of military linguists was the cryptologic community. The National Security Agency (NSA), through its subordinate service cryptologic elements, maintained an extensive network of monitoring activities around the world that required several thousand linguists (most of them military linguists) in several dozen languages. Over two-thirds of the students trained at DLIFLC were slated to fill these requirements. In some languages the proportion was over ninety percent.

Military linguists had been involved in signals intelligence operations since before World War II. During the war, many of the graduates of the Military Intelligence Service Language School served in cryptologic assignments. When NSA was founded in 1952 it continued the vital interest in linguist training. In the early years it relied on the Army Security Agency to train linguists at the Army Language School and the Air Force Security Service to train linguists at several major civilian universities. It also built up a small language training school of its own. In the 1960s and 1970s the Defense Language Institute continued to supply the service cryptologic elements thousands of apprentice military linguists each year. In 1967 the Army Security Agency began to post experienced cryptologic NCOs to the institute

as technical language assistants, the forerunners of today's military language instructors.

The institute had frequent reminders of the importance of its largest "user agency." In January 1989 the commander of Naval Security Group, the Navy's service cryptologic element, dedicated the Presidio of Monterey's newly constructed fitness center in memory of CTI3 Patrick R. Price, USN, a Naval Security Group Command Russian linguist killed in an aircraft accident in 1986. Later that year the institute won approval to name the new military personnel building after Lieutenant Robert F. Taylor, USN, killed in 1969 while flying on a reconnaissance mission against North Korea. Taylor Hall was dedicated in January 1990. The Cryptologic Training System (CTS) also posted a full-time liaison officer to DLIFLC. For the first half of the year CTICM Daniel McCarthy, USN, served as the acting CTS representative until Hugh McFarland arrived in June 1989. In sheer numbers the cryptologic requirements dominated the institute's programs. Shifts in cryptologic requirements were the largest single factor in fluctuations in student load at DLIFLC. In FY 1988, for example, student input for cryptologic language training jumped 25% over the previous year. In FY 1989 it declined by 9%, but this was partially off-set by a 13% increase in non-cryptologic requirements.

In the 1980s NSA had stepped up its interest in language training, establishing final learning objectives (FLOs) and funding several educational technology initiatives, such as live foreign television broadcasts for classroom use, called SCOLA (Satellite Communications for Learning). It supported several other language training programs and sent a few military linguists each year to summer language institutes at civilian colleges and universities. In March 1989, NSA sponsored a cryptologic language training conference to discuss the issues facing the system.[18] Later in the year William K.S. Tobin took over as dean of the Language and Target Studies Department at the National Cryptologic School and visited DLIFLC in August. The agency reiterated that for its purposes Level 2 in listening and reading was the minimum acceptable proficiency level, and that "global" language proficiency, proficiency in all general language skills and vocabulary, was important.[19] During the year NSA monitored the implementation of FLOs at DLIFLC, an initiative that had been launched two years before to help prepare students for their voice intercept training at the Goodfellow Technical Training Center and, eventually, their job assignments (see Chapter 3).

NSA continued to be concerned with two more long-standing issues of language training at DLIFLC, the utilization of military language instructors and the exchange of data between DLIFLC and Goodfellow (described in Chapter 3). In general, however, the agency seemed to be pleased with the results. In May 1989 the Assistant Director of NSA for Training, Whitney E. Reed, told the other GOSC members that "although we have a long way yet to go, the DLIFLC's customer was increasingly satisfied."[20]

Treaty Verification Requirements

The most visible new requirement in 1988-89 was for military linguists to assist in treaty verification for the On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA). Advanced Russian speakers were needed with skill levels, particularly in speaking, that were much higher than commonly found among military linguists. The need was great, and DLIFLC's success in helping to train the necessary linguists over the first year had brought it much goodwill in Washington. The OSIA director, Brigadier General Roland LaJoie, USA, praised the institute at the January 1990 meeting of the GOSC and said he "look[ed] forward to a continuing working relationship."[21]

DLIFLC's crash efforts immediately following the signing of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty had matured into a solid program by 1989. This was the kind of program of which the institute and its faculty could be proud, providing advanced level training for a historic mission. The associate dean of the School of Russian II, Major John Eschrich, USA, became the DLIFLC liaison officer to OSIA. Eschrich was himself a graduate of the DLIFLC Russian basic course and a former member of the US Military Liaison Mission to the Soviet forces in East Germany. In March 1989 the School of Russian II began a special six-month course for OSIA students. By February 1990 it had graduated eighteen students from three classes.

The scope of future requirements remained hazy, and in the spring TRADOC directed DLIFLC to develop a contingency plan for a rapid expansion.[22] Other on-going arms control negotiations also held out the possibility of expanded requirements in other languages such as German, Polish, Czech, and Hungarian. Concern about how the DFLP would come to grips with these requirements was included in the Defense Policy Guidance and was raised by Senate staffers. The executive agent pressed OSIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to give projections, but with little result. The executive agent asked the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence to "continue to pursue joint staff policy decision" on language requirements for treaty verification.[23] The ultimate solution would have to be similar to that in other areas: identify the precise requirements, provide adequate resources for training, then pursue "life-cycle management" of the resulting linguists.

Special Operations Forces Requirements

The Special Operations Forces (SOF) community generated yet another set of language training requirements. As the Cold War receded into the past, most informed observers felt certain that "low intensity conflict" was the most likely threat the US faced around the world. Leading military journals devoted many pages to the analysis of the low end of the spectrum of conflict, such as the US Army Command and General Staff College's *Military Review*, which published special issues on low intensity conflict in February 1989 and January 1990. Army doctrine writers were putting the finishing

touches on key documents, such as Field Manual 100-20, *Military Operations in Low Intensity Conflict*, which finally appeared late in 1990.

When the Army originally organized the Special Forces in the 1950s, their mission was to work closely with the local populace, moving freely among them and speaking their languages. Many of the early Special Forces recruits were native speakers of the languages of the Soviet Union and the "captive nations" of Eastern Europe. For example, Colonel Vladimir Sobichevsky, USA, the DLIFLC school secretary and special operations project officer, immigrated from Russia as a teenager in the 1950s and enlisted in the US Army. The John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center had always taught foreign languages, and when the Defense Language Institute was formed in 1963, their independent program was allowed to continue. During more than a decade of conflict, many Special Forces members were taught the languages of Southeast Asia, such as Vietnamese, Thai, Laotian, Cambodian, and the obscure languages of the hill tribes. The Special Forces retained this emphasis on language training into the 1980s.

During 1989 the special operations community continued to evolve as its top-level leaders sought to find the right mix of organizations, doctrine, and equipment to meet its assigned missions. A new Army major command, the US Army Special Operations Command, was established at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, to become the Army component command of the US Special Operations Command, itself only two years old.

In 1989 the Army estimated it had 767 language-qualified special operations soldiers on active duty (counting Special Forces, civil affairs, and psychological operations), counting all languages and all skill levels. The other services combined had an estimated 210 special operations linguists.[24] The Army estimated its total SOF language requirements to be over four times that. In late 1988 the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict (ASD[SO/LIC]) had called a meeting to assess the language requirements of the SOF community, and at a "LIC Warfighting Seminar" in February 1989 the importance of language capability for fighting in that environment was brought out once again.

Discussion of the SOF language training problem quickly focused on defining the requirements. In a memorandum to ASD(SO/LIC) in January 1989 the Joint Chiefs of Staff admitted that "it became apparent during the discussions that we do not do a good job in forecasting and planning our language requirements far enough in advance to recruit and train prior to the actual need," which "had created a fluctuating language management process and an erratic seat fill" at DLIFLC.[25] Clearly an adequate training strategy could not be devised until the requirements had been properly defined.

The Special Forces were the ultimate pragmatists in the language training business, defining their requirements in terms of a minimum "survival" level of language capability, which they were certain could be acquired through intense bursts of instruction. A few SOF students came to DLIFLC each year, but the SOF community was far more likely to rely upon short courses at the Special Warfare Center, or contracted instruction, to meet their operational requirements. They were frequent users of the courses

offered by Technical Language Systems, Inc. (TLSI), of Englewood, Colorado, which had developed ten sp‹ al language courses for FORSCOM in the early 1980s and was developing five more. They also turned to DLIFLC for assistance in developing thirteen "special forces functional language courses" under contract. The first six of these courses, using materials written by contractors under the technical supervision of DLIFLC, began in March 1989. Staff talks continued between DLIFLC and the Special Warfare Center about the possibility of DLIFLC taking over the Special Warfare Center's language training program in its entirety, and the proposal was written into the institute's long range plan at an estimated annual cost of $2.5 million. But interest in these talks later waned.26 By the end of the year the Special Operations Command had settled on a working definition of its requirements that amounted to an acceptance of the status quo. Requirements for Level 2 language training would continue to be met through resident training at DLIFLC at current levels. Level 0 + and 1 capabilities, the bulk of their requirements, would continue to be met through the existing sources.27

After a year's worth of vigorous activity at the senior staff level, the problems of setting SOF language training on the right course had still not been overcome, leading one DLIFLC staff officer to complain "that the Special Forces language program is badly and systematically broken at the moment-- and that its solution has so far defied the efforts of many of our 'best and brightest.'"28 The greater problems with language training for psychological operations, civil affairs operations, and the large numbers of SOF personnel in the reserve components had barely been addressed. Much work remained to be done before this critical shortfall in the nation's foreign language requirements could be properly met.

Other Human Intelligence Requirements

A diverse group of military linguists continued to work outside the fields of cryptologic, treaty verification, and special operations in what was loosely called human intelligence (HUMINT), serving as defense attaches, security assistance officers, and prisoner of war interrogators. For the Army, 52% of its assigned linguists were noncryptologic. For the Marine Corps the figure was 43%. The Air Force and Navy had relatively fewer such requirements.

Two dramatic events in 1989 on opposite sides of the globe highlighted the contributions of these linguists. In April, Colonel James N. Rowe, USA, serving in the US military assistance and advisory group to the Philippines, was assassinated by the New Peoples Army in Manila. Rowe had first come to DLIFLC in the 1960s, when he had studied Chinese. While serving as a military advisor in South Vietnam he was captured by the Viet Cong. He later recounted his experiences in a gripping memoir, *Five Years to Freedom*. After several years of medical retirement he had returned to active duty and returned to DLIFLC in 1987 to study Tagalog.

The need for skilled interrogators was never greater than when the US invaded Panama in December 1989 and routed the Panamanian Defense

Force, and thousands of military and civilian detainees had to be screened by the US forces. Some of the units used in the operation, such as the 7th Infantry Division (Light) from Fort Ord, California, had no Spanish linguists assigned. DLIFLC's Spanish basic course graduates played an important role during the build-up, the combat phase, and the post-combat operations. Several Spanish-speaking military language instructors from DLIFLC were deployed on short notice when commanders realized that the lack of a language capability was a "war-stopper."

"In the past . . . language training has all too often been sacrificed on a variety of other bureaucratic altars," as George A. Carver recently wrote. "In the future it will simply not be possible for American intelligence officers to function effectively unless they are completely comfortable in the language of their country of assignment."[29]

This is easier said than done. HUMINT linguists generally require better speaking skills than cryptologic linguists and better all-round language skills that special operations linguists. But many have limited opportunities to use their language skills during peacetime or to be assigned to a country where their language was spoken. Many served in the reserve components, compounding the training challenge.

The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) exercised general oversight over training for these linguists, and Michael F. Munson, the Deputy Director for Resources, served as their spokesman. "Now is not the time to draw down HUMINT," he told his fellow GOSC members at their January 1990 meeting. He "expressed his opinion that HUMINT requirements are going to increase, and the opportunities for HUMINT involvement in Eastern Europe are growing."[30] He also sought to strengthen DIA's management role by establishing a civilian language program coordinator position. The Defense Intelligence Agency followed the example of NSA by writing final learning objectives for its non-cryptologic linguists at DLIFLC, which were implemented during the year.[31] The Defense Intelligence Agency also controlled another training program, the Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program (DA-LASP), designed to provide additional training to intelligence analysts and others who needed advanced language or area studies training.

The greatest number of non-cryptologic enlisted linguists were Army and Marine interrogators who attended follow-on training at the US Army Intelligence Center and School at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. Interrogator training there was conducted entirely in English, which led to the atrophy of the language skills of most students. In March 1989 the Defense Intelligence Agency began to study the establishment of language maintenance training to complement the training at the Intelligence Center.[32]

The Defense Intelligence Agency also oversaw the training of personnel for the Defense Attache System. Based on a long-standing agreement between DLIFLC and DIA, attache personnel were usually trained under contract at the Foreign Service Institute alongside their counterparts from the Department of State and other civilian agencies.

Many other students fell outside DIA's purview. Some were non-linguists, such as battalion and brigade commanders taking Gateway courses

prior to assignments overseas under a program first designed in the 1970s. During 1989, DLIFLC stopped teaching these classes in Monterey, but they were still offered under contract through the DLIFLC Washington Office. Odds and ends of language training requirements also came the institute's way. In August 1989, General Maxwell R. Thurman, USA, took an intensive eight-day Spanish tutorial en route to his new assignment as commander in chief of US Southern Command in Panama.

Another special group of Army linguists were the approximately 2,500 Foreign Area Officers, who combined language training with civilian postgraduate schooling (see Chapter 3).[33]

Command Language Programs

Not all military language training occurs at DLIFLC. Field commanders from all services have always tried to meet their language training needs in a variety of ways. Around the world, commands conduct maintenance and refresher training for their assigned linguists, as well as orientation training for non-linguists. Millions of DoD language training dollars are expended each year in these diverse programs. This proliferation of command language programs was one of the factors that led to the establishment in 1962-63 of a single DoD agency for language training, which was granted "technical control" over all DoD language training. In 1964 a DLI staff study looked at the profusion of command language programs and recommended that DoD eliminate those which were "not cost effective, do not satisfy authorized language training objectives, or which do not reach the personnel who should receive language training." In 1973 the General Accounting Office criticized DoD for the continued lack of coordination of command language programs and suggested that "some of these programs may be ineffective, that the training might better be provided by DLI, or that there is a need for DLI to supervise such training." In 1987 the TRADOC Inspector General concluded that the Army's command language programs were "disjointed, independent, parochial, and not receptive to outside influence." Increasing the effectiveness of these programs was one of the perennial problems of managing language training.[34]

For many years the institute's role was confined to developing non-resident training materials and shipping them to units in the field. During the 1980s DLIFLC drafted a master plan for expanding its role, but it had remained seriously underfunded. During 1989 there were signs of renewed vigor (see Chapter 3). The new commandant, who had served sixteen years of his Army career in Germany, was committed to providing better support to linguists in the field. During 1989 the Evaluation Division and the Language Program Coordination Office cooperated on writing a guide for command language programs managers, DLIFLC Pamphlet 351-1, "Evaluation Guidelines for DoD Command Language Programs" (released in draft in November 1989). They also hosted a one-week command language program managers workshop in November that brought together several dozen

managers from a variety of active and reserve component headquarters and units.

DLIFLC also experimented with new methods for "exporting" instruction to linguists in the field. For several years the institute had been developing interactive video programs that used the Army's standard EIDS machine as the delivery vehicle. In September 1989 they launched a pilot program using video teleconferencing to provide live interactive instruction to the field when several DLIFLC Arabic instructors taught a class of Arabic linguists at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, and Fort Stewart, Georgia, using the video teleconferencing facility at Fort Ord. The Language Program Coordination Office launched a computer bulletin board, "LingNet," to improve communications between DLIFLC and the field.

Nevertheless command language programs world-wide generally remained a weak link in the language cycle, and no user agencies or major commands were represented on the GOSC except NSA and DIA. The DLIFLC briefing on nonresident training to the GOSC in January 1990 laid out "Where We Are," "Where We Should Be," and "Why We Aren't There." It explained that "requests from the field exceed available resources" and they were "not prioritized," "not service validated," and were "met on a time-available basis."[35] One proposal was to schedule and resource nonresident training requirements similar to resident training requirements, such as the Air Force used for providing nonresident training for its counterpart Defense Language Institute English Language Center. But this was not acted upon.

Reserve Component Requirements

The most challenging requirement of all was in the reserve components, where thousands of military linguists could be found. Some were former active duty linguists recently released into the Individual Ready Reserve. Others had been recruited into reserve military intelligence units for their native-speaking ability or civilian-acquired language skills. Still others had been recruited and sent to basic language training at DLIFLC. For all of them, maintaining their proficiency in a part-time training environment was an almost insurmountable task. Yet many active duty commanders and their staffs hoped that reservist linguists could somehow plug the gaps in their ranks.

The challenge was greatest in the Army Reserve and Army National Guard, which had thousands of linguist requirements scattered across a variety of units, from tactical military intelligence companies to special forces groups to civil affairs and psychological operations companies. During 1989 a long-awaited initiative began to bear fruit as several Army National Guard linguist battalions were organized and began to recruit linguists. These units sent many of their members to DLIFLC for basic language training, although quotas were limited. Working to coordinate support to the reserves was the Reserve Forces Advisor at DLIFLC, Lieutenant Colonel Ronald Galasinski, USA. Forces Command was actively involved in providing contract language training programs for two-week annual training programs, as well as

contracting for nonresident course development, and many units relied on local contract instructors. The hoped-for impact of linguist proficiency pay was diluted for reserve linguists. For example, a highly proficient Chinese linguist on active duty could earn up to an additional $100 each month. Proficiency pay for reserve linguists with equal skills was prorated for each day of duty, or $13.32 per month for the average reservist--hardly a generous incentive.

The other services, with smaller numbers of linguists, had arrived at workable solutions. The Air Force Intelligence Agency, for example, kept over one hundred linguists on its rolls.[36] Yet overall the reserve components were unable to fulfill their promise to provide skilled linguists to support active duty requirements. The solution to the reserve component language problem remained to be discovered.

Other Federal Requirements

The Department of Defense was not the only federal government agency with language requirements. The Department of State and the Peace Corps both had long-established language training programs. Other agencies needed foreign language skills as well, such as the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the US Customs Service, the US Marshals Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Drug Enforcement Administration. During the late 1980s they turned to DLIFLC for various forms of assistance, ranging from testing to instructor training to resident language training. For example, during 1989 the Drug Enforcement Administration sent thirty agents to DLIFLC for Spanish instruction, and six more were enrolled in contract classes arranged through DLIFLC in the Washington, DC, area.[37]

The institute's leaders welcomed this as an opportunity to show how DLIFLC could support other federal programs. In an era in which DoD requirements might be on the decline, other federal requirements showed signs of growth.

Conclusion

The year concluded with two dramatic events that, each in its own way, pointed to the future of America in an uncertain international environment. The fall of the Berlin Wall symbolized the end of a half-century of superpower confrontation, and the invasion of Panama symbolized the country's continued need to defend its vital national interests with military force where necessary. Both had profound implications for the Defense Foreign Language Program. These new uncertainties, coupled with budget reductions, promised to make the job of managing the Department of Defense's language requirements more difficult than ever before. Several lessons were evident, among them the need for continued excellence in the "schoolhouse," better personnel management of military linguists, and careful forecasting of requirements. The next decade would call for a "force in being" of truly proficient military linguists, backed by a robust training base, for in the years

to come the system would be put to tests as yet undreamed of. While the services and the managers of the Defense Foreign Language Program worked to improve the linguist life cycle, the leaders of DLIFLC worked to provide the best possible resident language program.

Chapter Two
Managing the Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center in 1989

When the Board of Visitors gathered in August 1989 for their second annual meeting at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC), they saw an organization in motion. Shifting service requirements and on-going academic reforms were changing the face of the institute. The board challenged the institute to be pro-active: to "set its sights higher and establish a new expanded mission of not only meeting billet-oriented service requirements, but externalizing its capabilities to the services in the field and its graduates throughout their careers in their particular services." DLIFLC's leaders accepted both challenges: continuing to press forward with an comprehensive agenda to transform the institute's resident academic programs, while searching for new ways to "externalize its capabilities."[1] With dramatic changes taking place on the world scene and the arrival of a new commandant, change at DLIFLC was inevitable.

The institute's primary mission remained unchanged in 1989, as spelled out by Department of Defense (DoD) directive and joint service regulation. DLIFLC was the premier resident foreign language training institution for DoD, teaching courses in more than twenty languages. It had several secondary missions related to this, such as supporting command language programs, teaching specialized courses, developing language proficiency tests for a DoD-wide testing program, and conducting research into foreign language education. For this the institute employed over seven hundred civilian language instructors, most of whom were native speakers of the languages they taught.

The Command Group

The job of making all this happen, of producing proficient military linguists, fell to the institute's senior leadership. For the first half of the year Assistant Commandant Colonel Ronald I. Cowger, USAF, served as acting commander while the TRADOC staff was searching for a replacement for Colonel Todd Robert Poch, USA, who had resigned unexpectedly in September 1988 after one year in command.[2] Cowger had served as assistant commandant since the fall of 1987. He was an experienced command pilot and administrator with twenty-six years of service, although he had no previous experience in foreign language education. In his first year he had concentrated on resource management, information management, and student affairs. His transition as acting commandant was so smooth as to be almost imperceptible.

Serving as chief of staff was Captain John A. Moore, USN, the first naval officer of his rank ever to serve on the institute's headquarters staff. He had arrived just weeks before Colonel Poch's departure, coming from command of a Navy cryptologic activity in the Far East. He quickly took charge of all the administrative responsibilities that fell to the chief of staff of such a complex

organization and supported Cowger in every way he could (see Chapter 5). For nearly a year these two men, an Air Force colonel and a Navy captain, were in the unusual position of being senior leaders of an Army-operated school and reporting through an Army chain of command.

Joining Cowger and Moore in the command group was the institute's senior academic official, Dr. Ray T. Clifford. Clifford, who had served as provost since 1981, provided essential continuity to the institute's academic programs. Under his direction the institute continued to implement an ambitious reform program designed to improve the proficiency of its graduates. During the first half of 1989 he won a five-year reaccreditation, designed a new "proficiency enhancement plan" and reorganized the seven subordinate language schools into eight (see Chapter 3).

Another member of the leadership team during these months was the previous acting chief of staff, Colonel Vladimir Sobichevsky, USA, who had moved down the hall to become school secretary when Moore had come on board. The gregarious Special Forces officer managed the institute's critical support functions such as facilities, logistics, administrative support, and liaison with garrison authorities. In the spring of 1989 he led the institute to victory in the annual TRADOC Community of Excellence competition (see Chapter 5).

Also serving at the command-group level was the DLIFLC command sergeant major, the senior enlisted advisor to the commandant. Command Sergeant Major Charles R. Beale, USA, had served four commandants and occupied an office adjacent to the commandant's. When he retired on April 1, his replacement was Sergeant Major Samuel E. Cardenas, USA.[3]

Below the command group level the institute had a complex array of independent departments, directorates, and divisions based on a standard school model first designed by planners in TRADOC headquarters in the 1970s (see DLIFLC Memo 10-1, reissued in April 1989). The individual language departments were segregated into seven separate schools (reorganized into eight during the year), each headed by a civilian dean at the GS-13 level and an associate dean (major or lieutenant colonel). Academic support functions were loosely grouped into two separate directorates. The majority were in what the Army called a directorate of "training and doctrine." Testing, program evaluation, and research were combined into a directorate of "evaluation and standardization." A separate branch at the Presidio of San Francisco was closed down in January 1989.[4]

Support functions not strictly academic in nature were supervised by the school secretary (such as logistics and facilities) or by the chief of staff (such as the civilian personnel office, resource management, or information management). Student affairs were generally handled by the troop units: the US Army Troop Command, the 3483rd US Air Force Student Squadron (Air Training Command), the Naval Security Group Detachment Monterey, and the Marine Corps Administrative Detachment. The four troop unit commanders coordinated directly with the assistant commandant (although only the Army and Marine Corps troop commanders were rated in the DLIFLC chain of command.)

External Relations

Internal administration was only half the challenge of managing DLIFLC. As a former Secretary of the Treasury once put it, "You learn very quickly that you do not go down in history as a good or bad [leader] in terms of how well you ran the place."[5] Much of the command group's time was devoted to what the Army called "representing the organization to the larger society," that is, tending relationships with the external agencies and headquarters described in the previous chapter to ensure a balance between demands and resources and to be attentive to policy guidance.[6] This involved continual staff coordination, responding to taskings, presenting briefings, briefing visitors, and responding to inquiries from action officers. In the age of telephones and fax machines, coordination with external agencies had reached a fever pitch. By the fall of 1989 the command group was also connected with the Army-wide PROFS electronic mail system, a new source of queries and taskings.

First on the list of external agencies to which they had to be responsive was the Director of Training in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, who represented the Secretary of the Army as executive agent for the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) and was the most authoritative source of taskings and formal guidance (see Chapter 1). The executive agent staff action officer for the DFLP, Colonel Howard K. "Tip" Hansen, USA, worked closely with Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA, the chief of the DLIFLC Washington Office. When Hansen was reassigned in the spring, Kozumplik stepped in for two months as both the DLIFLC commandant's representative in Washington and the executive agent's staff action officer, leading him to quip that he never had to "non-concur" in one of his own recommendations. In September, Lieutenant Colonel Sandy Outerbridge, USA, took over as executive agent action officer.

The executive agent was advised by the DFLP general officer steering committee (GOSC). In 1989 the GOSC principals met twice, in Monterey in January and in Washington in May. During the rest of the year their staff action officers meet monthly in Washington and frequently communicated directly with DLIFLC on matters of interest to their own service or agency. One of the most important staff agencies represented on the committee was the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, and Communications (OASD[C3I]), which was charged with securing funding from Congress for the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the DFLP. The Director of Intelligence Resources and Training in this office, Craig L. Wilson, had been working on policy-level issues relating to the institute for over a decade. During 1989 he dealt with issues such as funding for construction and the New Personnel System.

The institute's leaders were also in frequent contact with TRADOC headquarters at Fort Monroe, Virginia, which was charged with the responsibility for administering all Army schools. The TRADOC staff was frequently involved in issues of internal administration of the institute such as staffing and budget. In January, Brigadier General Arvid E. West, USA,

brought a team to assess the institute's programs for Army initial entry trainees. In February the TRADOC Deputy Commanding General for Training, Lieutenant General John S. Crosby, USA, paid the institute a visit, and in April the TRADOC inspector general came to inspect training. The position of TRADOC action officer for DLIFLC in the Directorate of Enlisted Training changed hands in 1989 when Lieutenant Colonel Alan Meyer, USA, retired in the spring and was replaced by a civilian, Susan Schoeppler.

The Board of Visitors, first established in 1988, added yet another dimension to the management environment. Intended to be an independent source of advice and support for the commandant and the leaders of the DFLP, the board held its second annual meeting at the institute in August.

Many other governmental and non-governmental agencies and committees placed demands on the time of DLIFLC's leadership. The Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence visited in March and the Air Force Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence visited in June. In June Colonel Cowger also represented the institute in Madrid at the annual meeting of the heads of the NATO military language schools, known as the Bureau for International Language Coordination (BILC). In Washington, DLIFLC had a seat on D'ECOLE and the Interagency Language Roundtable, two informal government committees on language training issues. The institute also had frequent dealings with the American Council on Education, which reviewed the institute's programs to make credit recommendations, and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the leading academic association involved in foreign language education, which held its 1988 annual meeting in Monterey. The Protocol Office hosted these many visitors and helped organize many key events.

A special staff office, the Language Program Coordination Office, headed by Major Gary Chamberlin, USA, was responsible for a multitude of activities involving the interface between DLIFLC and the field, working at all levels from the policy level, such as assisting in drafting the new joint service regulation, to the mundane, such as arranging for short-term interpreting and translation taskings.

The institute's leaders also had to work with installation officials at nearby Fort Ord who provided base operations support at the Presidio of Monterey (see Chapter 5). Much of this day-to-day coordination was handled by the school secretary and his staff, but the command group often had to get personally involved.

This "representational" role consumed much of the attention of the institute's leaders, as they worked to secure the resources and political support necessary for the institute's programs to run smoothly. They also served as the buffers between the outside world and DLIFLC to allow the academic administrators and instructors to do their jobs with minimum interference. But they were organizational leaders as well, providing direction and leadership.

Looking Towards the Future

"All action starts with vision," according to the Army's leadership doctrine.[7] At DLIFLC the commander's vision was embodied in several master plans that linked ultimate goals with specific actions. The most comprehensive was *A Strategy for Excellence*, originally drafted in 1985-86 and frequently updated since then. The second was the "Long-Range Plan and Program" required by TRADOC and first submitted in 1989. The third (described in more detail in Chapter 3) was the "Proficiency Enhancement Plan," prepared at the direction of the executive agent in the spring of 1989. All three were intended to provide road maps to the future and a shared set of academic and administrative goals to focus the effort of the entire organization. These plans served to keep everyone "on track."

A Strategy for Excellence was reissued in June 1989 by the Directorate of Resource Management. It had been revised "to incorporate evolving strategies and to improve its usefulness as a program management tool for internal and external users."[8] The changes since the previous edition were evolutionary, and it remained the most comprehensive single statement of the goals for the institute. The statement of purpose and philosophy remained essentially unchanged, but the ten "sub-objectives" were reformatted into twenty-four "strategies." The status of pending actions were removed to a separate volume that was reserved for internal distribution. The strategies were grouped into six general areas following the approach adopted by the Information Systems Plan developed the previous year:

o Center of Excellence
o Defense Foreign Language Program
o Instruction
o Human
o Quality of Life
o Management

The master plan was matched by the "Long-Range Plan and Program," submitted to TRADOC headquarters in June 1989. According to the cover letter, this document was the "vehicle through which we establish our resource needs to higher headquarters" and thus played a vital "role in creating our future resource environment." It forecast new initiatives in fifteen different areas. The most expensive of these were picking up SOF language training at an estimated cost of $2.5 million per year, increasing the training capacity of the school for another $2.5 million, and the New Personnel System, estimated to grow to $1.379 million in four years. But planning was only the first step. Next, resources had to be obtained to translate these plans into reality.

Looking Inward: Resource Management

The institute was fortunate to have steady funding levels in 1989: overall funding came to $48.3 million, compared to $48.0 the previous year.

The year began with a $10.4 million shortfall, but by the time the FY 1989 installation contract was signed in December 1988 this had been restored. In fact, the institute ended up with more funding than it could spend. Difficulties in hiring new instructors caused civilian workyears to remain below the budgeted target. By the end of the year, workyears fell by nearly 4% compared to the previous year, which had been an all-time high. This was counterbalanced by a 4.1% raise for civilian employees in January 1989, leaving the total payroll the same as 1988. Much of this "hire lag" money was reprogrammed into buying computer equipment and software, a record $1.3 million worth, before the Army imposed a freeze on automatic data processing acquisitions. This was nearly matched by almost $800,000 worth of computer hardware and software funded outside normal channels, including an IBM 4361 mainframe procured as excess from another Army activity for the cost of transportation.[9]

The ups and downs of the annual budget roller coaster were tracked by the Resource Management directorate, headed by Major Randy R. Beckman, USA, and budget officer Caroline J. Bottger. The Internal Review Office at nearby Fort Ord conducted an audit of the institute's budget operations during the year and found everything running well. Nevertheless, factors beyond the institute's control made the task of managing the institute's resources very difficult. Keeping workyears and dollars, especially contract dollars, on-track was like trying to hit a moving target. A freeze on computer purchasing, combined with contract problems with two course development projects, caused the institute to turn back $921,000 unspent by July 1989. The Resource Management directorate managed to close out the year with a 99.9994% obligation rate.[10]

Fiscal Year 1990 got off to a slow start when for several months Congress and the Executive Branch failed to agree on a budget. The uncertainties were heightened by the threat of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act sequestration, which forced the institute to keep its expenditures well below the previous year's level. When the first Resource Advisory Subcommittee meeting for FY 1990 was held in November, the funding picture was still unclear, and the institute was still facing a 10% funding shortfall. The Resource Advisory Committee was not able to meet until December 20.[11] But by year's end the institute's FY 1990 budget had been released and training operations were able to continue uninterrupted, even though the installation contract was not finalized until the following February.

Looking Inward: Eliminating Low-Density Language Departments

The close scrutiny of available resources during 1987-88 led the executive agent to decide to close the ten smallest language departments, which was approved by the General Officer Steering Committee in January 1989. The cryptologic agencies had limited or no collection requirements in these languages, and the human intelligence community had very few. Four were the languages of East European nations not on the front lines against NATO: Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, and Yugoslavia. Three others were

Pacific Rim languages: Indonesian, Malaysian, and Chinese-Cantonese. Two, Dari and Pashto, had been a requirement during the Afghanistan civil war, which was coming to an end. One, Norwegian, was the language of a NATO ally. During FY 1988 only twenty-six students began training in these languages, making it impossible to justify keeping thirty-one full-time employees in the ten departments on the payroll.

The institute's leadership had tried to fend off the elimination of these "low-density" departments, arguing that the Department of Defense would be losing irreplaceable assets as a hedge against future training requirements, test development, or translation services. No one claimed that contract instruction could duplicate the resident instruction long available at DLIFLC, especially since it was tailored to military requirements. "However painful" the decision was to DLIFLC, Cowger wrote, "the concept was really a matter of economy and efficiency."[12] The move promised to save up to $660,000 by shifting from languages with a low student-faculty ratio to those with a higher ratio. Future training requirements would be handled through the long-established contract language training program in the Washington, DC, area.

The faculty union filed a grievance, claiming that the institute was violating federal regulations on contracting out. DLIFLC's managers insisted this was not contracting out within the terms of the regulations, but merely adding on to a pre-existing program, the contract foreign language training program operated by the DLIFLC Washington Office. The dispute led to an unprecedented level of acrimony between union leaders and DLIFLC management. The union called for arbitration and complained to the local congressman, and in April the Subcommittee on Defense of the Senate Appropriations Committee held a one-day hearing. Congressman Panetta wrote the commandant to express his concern over the matter. In an internal memorandum written later in the spring, Colonel Cowger called the "negotiations, deliberations, grievance and arbitration . . . very difficult and emotional."[13]

By July, negotiations on the reduction-in-force (RIF) were completed and RIF actions were begun. The internal regulations for RIFs were updated for the first time since 1976.[14] By year's end all thirty-one employees had been affected. Three temporaries were terminated, eight permanent employees were separated, six were retired, two were placed in reorganization, and one was reassigned. An editorial in the union newsletter later that year claimed that "the whole issue has caused irreparable harm to all employees affected, and has lowered the morale of the staff at the DLI."[15]

The eliminations soon were reflected in statistics bearing on the efficient operation of the institute. Within two years the average number of students per section rose from 6.9 (First Quarter, FY 1988) to 7.9 (First Quarter, FY 1990), and the number of sections with four or fewer students sank from 59 to 15.[16] By 1990 the DLIFLC resident program had shrunk to twenty languages, the lowest level since 1948. Nevertheless this unpopular step gave the institute's leaders much-needed flexibility to hire more instructors in languages in greater demand.

Washington Office

The DLIFLC Washington Office, headed by Lieutenant Colonel Peter W. Kozumplik, USA, was an important part of the institute's management team. Kozumplik kept DLIFLC closely tied in with important managerial issues within the DFLP. He served as a liaison officer between the institute and the members of the GOSC and their action officers, and was a conduit of daily queries and taskings from the executive agent. There was no major issue in foreign language training within DoD in which Kozumplik was not involved to some degree.

Kozumplik's experience at the DFLP level led him to propose the strengthening of his office to encompass all coordination with outside agencies. In December 1989 he proposed the consolidation of his office with the Language Program Coordination Office at DLIFLC. This would make a single office responsible for "all interface with DFLP leaders and customers regarding matters of policy," and "integrated strategic policy development." He also proposed to augment his staff with an Air Force officer during the year. By the end of the year both plans remained on the drawing board.[17]

In July the office moved from a GSA-operated office building near the Foreign Service Institute in Arlington, Virginia, into new office space in Crystal City. New computer equipment, new furniture, and more space allowed the office and its staff to support the institute more effectively. The office, under the management of Kozumplik's administrative assistant Ivy Gibian, also managed what amounted to a separate language school. Several hundred students each year were instructed under contract at the Foreign Service Institute and several commercial language schools in the area. For FY 1989 this amounted to a $1.8 million program. The office of the TRADOC Inspector General reviewed the program during the year and made several recommendations. The office also continued to give advanced Russian language training to personnel assigned to MOLINK, the Moscow-Washington "hotline."

A New Vision: Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr.

On August 11, 1989, Colonel Donald C. Fischer, Jr., USA, assumed command of DLIFLC and began to make his presence felt at once. An ordnance officer with many years experience in managing complex logistical operations, Fischer had just completed two years in command of the 8th Infantry Division (Mechanized) Support Command in West Germany. His previous commands included an engineer company in Vietnam (1968-69) and a missile maintenance battalion in Germany (1981-83). His educational and professional background made him an unlikely candidate for the job: his bachelors degree was in education; he had one masters degree in management logistics (from the Air Force Institute of Technology) and another in military arts and sciences (from the US Army Command and General Staff College); and he was a graduate of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. But he had served in Germany for seventeen years, was a self-taught German

speaker, and had been consistently involved in managing training throughout his Army career.

Before Fischer took command he visited field sites in Germany where linguists were assigned and attended the May 1989 meeting of the General Officer Steering Committee in Washington. In Europe and Washington he heard praise for the institute and was told repeatedly that the services and user agencies thought that DLIFLC was moving in the right direction.[18] His new boss, the TRADOC Deputy Commanding General for Training, Lieutenant General John S. Crosby, USA, gave him a list of fifteen "points of emphasis" that were a recapitulation of the issues and initiatives of recent years. Crosby directed him to continue to work on the initiatives of his predecessors, including team teaching, the New Personnel System, and support to the On-Site Inspection Agency and the Drug Enforcement Administration. He urged him to "continue work on enhancing DLI's credibility throughout the linguist community" and to "continue emphasis on enhancing the non-resident program." The mission was complex, and the visibility was high.[19]

"The acid test of an officer who aspires to high command," Field Marshal Montgomery once wrote, "is his ability to be able to grasp quickly the essentials of a military problem."[20] Fischer quickly grasped that agreed-upon goals, and accountability to those goals, were vital within such a complex organization as DLIFLC. For his transition he chose the "I will" process, a process of determining corporate vision and developing specific objectives from that vision for each organizational element. By this method he hoped to achieve a consensus on goals and timetables for achieving them.[21]

In Fischer's first few months in command, the institute felt a new wind blowing through departments and staff offices. Although not himself a DLIFLC graduate, he combined an intuitive grasp of the learning process and an intense desire to make the process more efficient. The only way the institute could achieve the ambitious 80% 2/2 goal set by the general officer steering committee, he felt, was to make the instructors more productive teachers and the students more productive learners. He challenged some traditions, such as morning physical training, which left many students too tired to pay attention in class. He championed the expanded use of computers in the classroom, including tapping the potential of Apple Macintosh computers for computer-assisted study. He called for bold innovation and experimentation in the classroom and urged the faculty to expand their professional development. He lobbied with TRADOC and the executive agent for more resources for curriculum development. Fischer also articulated a long-range vision of the role of DLIFLC in a future national security environment in which non-cryptologic requirements might play a greater role.

Most of all he called for new approaches to the delivery of language instruction to military personnel outside the walls of the institute. His vision of the future convinced him that a myopic focus on resident language instruction would doom the institute to obsolescence. "Overall, the greatest contribution I believe we can make to the nation," he told his staff, "would be to bring language learning through distance methods to the highest level possible."[22]

New Challenges

The new commandant had little time for reflection before becoming caught up in the press of events. Five days after taking command he hosted the annual meeting of the Board of Visitors. In September a student was killed in an automobile accident. In October a major earthquake struck Northern California causing a total power failure and other disruptions, though no injuries or damage at the institute. He continued the busy round of "representational" functions in Washington and Monterey. Then a sudden turn of events in Central America at the end of the year brought into sharp focus the importance of his new job.

In December President Bush launched a lightning invasion to unseat Panamanian dictator General Noriega. The operation also exposed the shortage of Spanish linguists in the US Army. The 82nd Airborne Division and the XVIIIth Airborne Corps had a few Spanish linguists, but they were desperate for more. The 7th Infantry Division (Light) had none at all. Field commanders confronted three unpleasant realizations, as had commanders in previous conflicts: first, that military linguists were essential to mission accomplishment; second, that they did not have sufficient numbers of linguists in the right languages assigned; and third, that many of their linguists were not sufficiently proficient to get the job done.

DLIFLC had little experience in rapid response to contingency requirements, and as an educational institution there was little it could do in the short term. The Spanish basic course, for example, was six months long. Four military language instructors were deployed within days to support the 7th Infantry Division (Light) and the US Southern Command J-2 staff. When active combat operations were over after the first day, thousands of detainees remained to be interrogated and tens of thousands of civilian refugees remained in need of assistance. Only with the herculean efforts of a handful of Spanish linguists, together with some Spanish-speaking soldiers who were assigned in non-linguist duty positions, was the mission accomplished.

Operation Just Cause brought home to America's leaders the potential instability of the post-Cold War era. The new commandant could see that DLIFLC would have to set its sights higher than ever before. Alongside the continuing cryptologic requirements, which represented the bulk of the training at DLIFLC, other requirements were expanding. The language needs for arms control treaty verification, support to law enforcement agencies, and special operations forces were growing. The ability to deliver quality language instruction to the world outside its walls was a vital part of the institute's future role. For this DLIFLC needed adaptable leadership and flexible structure. But most of all it needed high quality, innovative academic programs to support the resident and nonresident training missions. The quality of the institute's academic programs was the foundation for everything else.

In the spring of 1989 the Western Association of Schools and Colleges sent a team of experienced educators for a five- year review of accreditation of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC). They were impressed with what they saw: the largest assemblage of foreign language educators in the United States teaching some thirty different foreign languages to more than 3,000 students. Even more impressive, they saw a large organization, nearing its fiftieth anniversary, engaged in a program of extensive self-renewal. Its purpose was to produce military linguists more proficient than ever before. Key elements of the reforms underway included improved student-teacher ratios, team teaching, updated course materials, and new proficiency tests. Still on the drawing board were more course development projects, new computer and video systems for the classrooms, and the promotion of one third of the instructors to the next higher grade. Also in the works were an entirely revamped "rank-in-person" personnel system and awarding graduates the associate of arts degree. Taken together, these initiatives would amount to a revolution in the classroom that would have a major impact on the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) for years to come.[1]

The Drive for Proficiency

In January 1989 the General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) for the DFLP directed DLIFLC to come up with an action plan to boost student proficiency. They challenged the institute to bring 80% of its students to the level identified several years before as the minimum required for on-the-job performance: Level 2 in listening, Level 2 in reading, and Level 1 in speaking, based on the Interagency Language Roundtable scale. Of the languages most frequently taught at DLIFLC, graduates of the Spanish basic course had come closest to this, as had several smaller departments. From Russian, a Category III language, roughly half of all graduates were meeting the goal, and far fewer graduates of Category IV languages such as Arabic, Chinese, and Korean. The GOSC directed the institute to achieve these targets within one to three years, depending on language category.[2]

The call for a new master plan was an opportunity for the institute's leadership to pull together some key reforms they had been pushing for several years, especially those with significant resource implications. The provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford, established a task force under Colonel William Kinard, USA, then acting dean of the Middle East School, to draft a "Proficiency Enhancement Plan," designed to inject new "pep" into the reform drive. The final plan as presented to the GOSC at a special meeting in Washington, DC, in May 1989, was more tightly focused and results-oriented than the *Strategy for Excellence* master plan developed in 1985-86. It proposed five key initiatives:

more in-service training for the faculty, reorienting instruction to a proficiency-oriented approach, maintaining a workable span of control for academic administrators, applying more educational technology, and extending course lengths for more difficult languages. Improved outcomes were explicitly linked to increased resourcing: continued implementation of team teaching, approval and implementation of the New Personnel System, better screening of student input, and stable overall student input and funding levels. The GOSC approved this plan at the "constrained" level and authorized the experimental extension of the length of one Category IV basic course, Arabic, from 47 to 63 weeks. Brigadier General Larry G. Lehowicz, the chairman, called the plan the last step needed to "fix the schoolhouse."

Numerous other initiatives were underway to "fix the schoolhouse," many of them in the individual language departments and schools. A number of changes were spreading that were designed to strengthen the institute's academics. Final Learning Objectives (FLOs), an initiative launched the previous year at the request of the National Security Agency, blossomed as all departments that sent students to follow-on cryptologic training at the Goodfellow Technical Training Center developed and implemented supplementary basic course tracks.[3]

Full implementation of team teaching came closer to reality during the year as the staffing ratio approached 2:1 in most departments (two instructors per ten-student section). In FY 1989 the ratio reached 1.96, compared to 1.51 just four years earlier. Unwilling to wait for Congressional action on the New Personnel System, the provost established one GS-11 "mentor" position for each six-person team. Shortly after his arrival the new commandant began to push for an additional GS-11 on each team. During 1989 all permanent GS-11 supervisors were redesignated mentors, and scores of GS-9 instructors were promoted for the first time.[4]

As the institute had moved to proficiency-based testing with the more recent Defense Language Proficiency Tests, a gap in grading policies had opened up, with the individual departments and schools still basing in-course grades on hundreds of older, achievement-oriented tests. In the spring of 1989 the provost took steps to change the whole approach to testing and grading, "to assure that in-course grades more accurately predict the student's graduation proficiency." This was an important step towards the long-term goal of the institute's granting academic degrees. Most academic regulations were revised and reissued over the winter of 1988-89.[5]

The institute also worked to enhance its academic stature by publishing two scholarly journals, one in-house and one for external distribution. The internal bulletin, *Applied Language Learning*, first appeared in July 1989. It was published by the Faculty and Staff Development Division and contained four articles by scholars in the field of foreign language learning. The other, *Dialog on Language Instruction*, appeared the following spring and contained an article reprinted from the *Modern Language Journal*, and two full scale research reports and several shorter pieces by members of the institute's own staff.

The winds of change were blowing through the institute in 1989. The initiatives of previous years began to bear fruit, and new initiatives were proposed. Encouraged by a supportive GOSC and an energetic new commandant, the provost, deans, and department chairs plunged ahead with changes on a broad front. Fully 52.1% of graduating students met the 2/2 goal in FY 1989, up from 32.9% just three years before. Most of the credit went to the instructors and other staff members in the individual departments and staff divisions that were implementing the many separate changes that together were adding up to a revolution.

The Changing Schools

Two reorganizations affected the institute during 1989, each with different results. One, the closing of ten "low-density" departments as described in Chapter 2, gave the institute's leaders the flexibility to divert the position authorizations and workyears to languages where the staffing ratio was still lagging. During 1989 the thirty-one loyal instructors in the targeted languages graduated their last students and reluctantly went into non-teaching positions, retirement, or for an unfortunate few, unemployment. Their professionalism to the end was an inspiration to their colleagues. The institute went from teaching thirty languages to just twenty in less than a year, the smallest number since 1948.

The other major change, the realignment of the language schools, was carried out over the summer by the provost, Dr. Ray T. Clifford. He announced the changes in May to take effect in July. His purpose was twofold: to equalize the size of the schools, which had grown lopsided over time as student enrollment fluctuated, and to rotate the institute's senior academic leadership. In both he succeeded. The largest school, the Asian School, was split in two by moving the Korean departments into a new Korean School. The East European School was completely reorganized. The Polish Department was added to the former Germanic School to form a new Central European School. The two remaining Czech departments were joined by two Russian departments from the Russian School I to form a new Slavic School with a new dean recruited from outside the institute. The reorganization brought the number of separate schools to eight, with each having four to five departments. By the time the new commandant arrived in August, six of the eight deans were new to their schools.

The eight deans applied much the same approach in each school, with individual variations depending on the circumstances: in-service instructor training, supplementing course materials, and experimenting with computers. They worked to involve the department chairs and to take new looks at old programs. The picture was different in each school, but the goal was the same: increasing student proficiency as measured by the DLPT.

Asian School

The Asian School began the year as the institute's largest school with Ben DeLaSelva, a former course developer, as its dean. In July the school was split in two. The Korean departments were split off and the remaining Chinese Department and Multi-Language Department (Japanese, Tagalog, Thai, and Vietnamese) were joined by the Persian-Farsi Department to form a new, smaller Asian School under Dave Olney, the former chief of the Nonresident Training Division and a former Chinese linguist. During the rest of the year the two schools gradually divided up their administrative staff, space, and functions.

The Chinese Department produced continued gains in student proficiency, raising the percentage of students achieving 2/2 from 15% (FY 87-88) to 25% (FY 89), even though the number of students rose by half. The new dean began to lay the groundwork for an external review of the Chinese curriculum and the use of educational technology to Chinese. He also reviewed the Thai Branch, where student proficiency results had been declining for several years. The newest department to the school, the Persian-Farsi Department, brought an astonishing 86% of their basic course graduates to the 2/2 goal in FY 1989, the highest rate for any language at DLIFLC, even though their student input nearly doubled.

Central European School

The Germanic School began 1989 with three German departments and one multi-language department (Norwegian and Dutch) under Peter J. Armbrust, a former German department chair. Student proficiency in the 34-week German basic course remained stuck just short of the 50% mark, and the faculty was disheartened at the layoffs of their former colleagues at the San Francisco Branch the previous year.

In July, Armbrust and Dr. Martha Herzog, dean of the Romance School, traded places. Herzog, who had served in the Romance School for three years, pushed for more faculty in-service training and increased use of computers. The German VELVET interactive video program, in existence for several years as a Gateway program for non-linguists, was transferred to EIDS and tried out in the early weeks of the German basic course. A new program of interactive video courseware, the D-DISC project, was already under development.

The Polish Department, located just off campus in the Larkin Schoolhouse, was added to the school, necessitating the name change to "Central European School." Student proficiency in the 47-week Polish basic course, which had fluctuated in the 35-45% range for several years, rose to over 50% in FY 1989. The Dutch Branch was transferred to the Romance School.[6]

Korean School

The institute's newest school was the Korean School. Charles E. Cole, former academic coordinator of the Russian School II, was named its first dean. The four Korean departments were heavily involved in developing supplementary materials for the FLOs and listening comprehension. In July the school also co-sponsored the third biennial conference of the International Association for Korean Language Education, held in Monterey, the first time, the school later reported, "for many faculty members to get together with a large number of Korean language educators from outside of DLI to exchange academic ideas and experience."7 Lasting gains in student proficiency nevertheless continued to elude the Korean faculty. In FY 1988 basic course students jumped up to 40% scoring over 2/2 on the DLPT, but in FY 1989 this dropped back to below 35%. The Korean curriculum was scheduled for an extensive external review in the following year.8

Middle East School

The Middle East School began 1989 under the leadership of Colonel William Kinard, USA, a former associate dean at the school and military attache in the region. The Arabic language was widely regarded as being one of the most difficult languages at DLIFLC to learn. For three straight years barely 20% of the students were able to meet the 2/2 standard. Only Chinese students scored lower. Most students followed the 47-week Modern Standard Arabic basic course with a 16-week dialect extension course before going to follow-on training at Goodfellow or elsewhere. Arabic seemed an ideal language for an experiment to lengthen the basic course to 63 weeks, since the services were already assigning their students to DLIFLC for that length of time. In January 1989 the institute won approval from the General Officer Steering Committee for this extension, using a dialect "flavor" instead of a separate extension course for the spoken Egyptian and Syrian dialects the cryptologic user agencies overwhelmingly preferred. This extended basic course, which became the centerpiece of the institute's Proficiency Enhancement Plan, began in October.

In July, Kinard retired and was replaced by Ben DeLaSelva, the school's fourth dean in five years. DeLaSelva came from four years as dean of the institute's largest school, the Asian School. The summer reorganization brought several other changes as well. The Persian-Farsi Department was shifted to the Asian School, and the Multi-Language Department closed Dari and Pashtu, retained Hebrew and Turkish, and at the end of the year picked up the Greek Branch from the East European School.

The three Arabic departments were unusually active in developing nonresident training materials, which were in great demand, especially from Army tactical military intelligence units. User agencies such as the Third US Army took an active interest in the development of new courses, including the Cultural Orientation Program-Egypt and the Sinai Orientation course. In September several Arabic instructors scored another first when they gave

refresher training to several Army linguists at two locations using a two-way television link, initially using the video teleconferencing center at Fort Ord. The following year this matured into video teletraining using new equipment.[9]

Romance School

The Romance School was little affected by the reorganization. Dr. Martha Herzog had overseen the growth of the Spanish program to three departments and the rise of student proficiency to 70% reaching 2/2, the highest percentage of any large language program, even though the course was only 27 weeks long. Armbrust took over as dean in July. Within the Multi-Language Department two branches, Norwegian and Romanian, were eliminated during the year, and Dutch was added. Together with French, Italian, and Portuguese, these branches continued to produce excellent results.

Changes were underway inside and outside the school. Outside the school, interest in Spanish language training was growing in federal agencies involved in drug interdiction, such as the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Customs Service, and the Coast Guard. In August the outgoing TRADOC commanding general, General Maxwell R. Thurman, USA, came to DLIFLC for eight days of intensive Spanish instruction prior to his new assignment as commander-in-chief of US Southern Command. In December forces under his command launched a surprise invasion of Panama, Operation Just Cause. Many graduates of the DLIFLC Spanish basic course were actively involved in the invasion and its aftermath. Four of the school's seven Spanish military language instructors were deployed to assist.

Changes were also underway in other languages within the school. The Portuguese branch began to rewrite their basic course to combine for the first time both European and Latin American Portuguese. Computer training and other faculty development efforts were in full swing. Outside the school the associate dean, Lieutenant Colonel Robert Anchondo, USA, laid out elaborate landscaping around the five-year-old Munakata Hall that won the school praise during the annual TRADOC Community of Excellence inspection that spring. The beautiful gardens outside the Romance School could have stood as symbols for the blossoming of the departments within, but like the gardens, the departments had to be carefully "resourced" and properly taken care of to flower.[10]

School of Russian I

The School of Russian I continued through 1989 under the leadership of Lubow Solgalow, a former Russian department chair who had been appointed as dean when the two Russian schools had split in late 1986. After three years of recruiting new instructors and intensive faculty development, the percentage of students reaching the 2/2 goal had more than doubled from 23% to 58%. Solgalow pushed to reach even higher, and during the year the first six modules of the basic course were rewritten to stress proficiency over achievement.

The school also undertook a major landscaping project to spruce up its old wooden classroom buildings (built when Nicholas II was still czar). The school also shrank to more manageable size when two of its departments were given over to the new Slavic School and the number of instructors dropped from 146 to 106.[11]

School of Russian II

The newest Russian school, headed by Alex Vorobiov, continued to lead the institute in gains in student proficiency. By 1989 fully 67% of the students reached the 2/2 goal, compared to 23% just three years before. The school was housed in the institute's newest academic building, Nicholson Hall. The school taught a broader range of Russian courses than its sister school down the hill, including the 27-week Le Fox continuation course, the special basic course for Army Foreign Area Officers, and an intermediate/advanced course for treaty inspectors. This new course, which matured into a full 27-week course during 1989, produced its first six graduates in November. The school was the first to receive a satellite dish antenna for the reception of foreign language television broadcasts for classroom use.

For this reason for a short time it was named the "School of Russian Studies," as contrasted to the "School of the Russian Language." This soon proved confusing, and in 1989 they were renamed the Schools of Russian I and II. During 1989 the school lost a few of its instructors to the new Slavic School, its academic coordinator to be the first dean of the new Korean School, and two department chairs who retired.[12]

School of Slavic Languages

The East European School had all the hallmarks of Eastern Europe itself: often neglected by the larger powers, and composed of small nations joined not by natural affinity, but by accident of geography. The Czech and Polish departments lived in uneasy alliance with the Bulgarian, Greek, Hungarian, and Serbo-Croatian branches of the Multi-Language Department. In its five years of existence as a separate school, three men had held the position of dean, most recently Joe Yonan.

In July the school was split when the Polish Department was reassigned to join the three German departments to form the Central European School. Yonan and his academic coordinator were reassigned, Yonan taking over the Nonresident Training Division. This gave the provost the opportunity to hire a new dean and academic coordinator from outside the institute. For dean he chose Dr. Betty Lou Leaver, a department chair at the State Department's Foreign Service Institute. In November Leaver in turn selected as academic coordinator Dr. Maurice Funke, who had recently returned from several years as chairman of the German Department at INSCOM's Foreign Language Training Center-Europe (FLTCE).

The new school was a challenge to lead. Initially it was spread out in nine buildings in four separate locations. Part of the Polish Department and

the Slovak Branch were off post in the Larkin School. During Leaver's first six months as dean she supervised the closure of three small branches, Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Serbo-Croatian, the transfer of a fourth, Greek, to the Middle East School, and the transfer of two Russian departments from the School of Russian I (one of whose chairmen retired at the end of the year). Student proficiency results in Czech showed promising increases from 48% to 60%, but initial results in the two Russian departments were only 44% for all of FY 1989, well below what the two Russian-only schools were producing.[13]

Academic Support

Standing behind these eight schools, each with over a hundred language instructors, were a series of staff divisions and offices charged with providing specialized academic support, such as in-service training, coordinating course development, writing tests, bringing new technology into the classrooms, and supporting linguists in the field. Many of the taskings undertaken during the year did not fit into these neat boxes, and joint efforts were common, such as the Educational Technology and Curriculum divisions cooperating on an interactive video course development project. Under the standard TRADOC school model, these divisions should have been grouped under two directorates, one for "training and doctrine" and one for "evaluation and standardization." At DLIFLC the "training and doctrine" functions were further divided in 1988. Dr. Vu Tam Ich, who had served with the Defense Language Institute headquarters since 1964, supervised three divisions as vice provost: Curriculum, Faculty & Staff Development, and Educational Technology. Lieutenant Colonel Jack Golphenee, USA, supervised the remaining four: Resident Training, Nonresident Training, Area Studies, and the academic library.[14]

Curriculum Development

The story of curriculum development at DLIFLC is the history of the institute in miniature. Every possible approach had been tried at one time or another. The institute's leaders freely admitted that many courses needed to be updated and recast for the new proficiency-based approach. The Proficiency Enhancement Plan stated that "many of the DLI language courses were designed years ago--some of the oldest are 25 years old--based on older philosophies of how to teach languages."[15]

In 1989 the institute's approach to course development was under review. A new edition of DLIFLC Memo 5-2, "Curriculum Planning, Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation," was released in February, only to be immediately withdrawn from circulation. In the summer and fall the Resident Training Division prepared another draft, which was still being debated at year's end. The TRADOC staff, who had their own ideas on the best way to undertake course development and who allocated civilian workyears specifically for the function, were also concerned. Most concerned of all were

the instructors, who supplemented the existing texts as best they could while waiting for the system some day to provide them with something better.

Overseeing all course development was the Curriculum Division headed by Dr. Mahmood Taba Tabai. The actual work of course-writing was done by teams of instructors or contractor course-writers under the guidance of the division's personnel. The division provided training and guidance for course-writing teams for a new Vietnamese basic course, a new Chinese intermediate course, a new Portuguese basic course, and portions of the Japanese basic course. Two Arabic-Egyptian speakers were hired to prepare a 40-hour course for the Third US Army for US soldiers deploying to Egypt, called Central Region Orientation Program-Egypt (CROP-E), later renamed Cultural Orientation Program-Egypt (COPE).[16]

Contract course-writers were also at work developing materials in several areas. One project involved a new generation of nonresident courses called "Proficiency Improvement Courses" in Czech, Polish, and Russian. The other involved writing 12-week courses for the US Army Special Forces, called Special Forces Functional Language Courses. Classes using these materials in six languages were started in March at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, with DLIFLC staff providing on-going quality assurance. Several other contract course development projects were at various stages of development, including interactive video courses for German, Spanish, Greek, and Turkish.

The division made a major investment during the year in computers for desktop publishing, expanding its network to sixty-seven Xerox Star workstations, dubbed the Electronic Foreign Language Training Materials Development System. These systems, once enough instructors were trained, promised to transform the way textbooks and other materials were produced.[17]

Faculty & Staff Development

The institute's efforts to make its instructors more effective took equal billing with the development of new courses. Forced to choose, the provost would not hesitate to take an excellent teacher burdened with a mediocre textbook over the reverse. The Proficiency Enhancement Plan put faculty development at the top of the action plan. "DLI must wage a major campaign to change to the new methods of teaching for proficiency. That campaign must retrain all faculty members and their managers."[18]

Much of this work was done in the schools. The creation of teaching teams, each headed by a GS-11 "mentor," was a step in this direction. Schools held in-service training sessions when classes were not in session, shared expertise, and invited outside speakers for lectures and workshops. Late in the year GS-11 faculty trainer positions in each school were approved to bring together these in-house efforts.

Much of the faculty training work, including the basic Instructor Certification Course, was done by the Faculty and Staff Development Division, headed by Dr. Neil Granoien. His staff grew to sixteen during 1989 and was reorganized into three branches: Faculty Development, Instructional Technology, and Academic Staff Development. Dozens of new instructors were

trained in the Instructor Certification Course. Many others took the "Teaching for Proficiency" workshop. Other special workshops were designed to teach instructors how to use computers in the classroom and team-building. In the fall the division began to develop an Army-designed course for civilian leadership development, entitled "LEAD" (Leadership and Development), which was first offered in January 1990.[19]

Few instructors possessed professional credentials in foreign language education when they were first hired, so DLIFLC also encouraged them to pursue outside professional development. Since 1986 the institute had been underwriting the costs of the master of arts in the teaching of foreign languages (MATFL) offered by the Monterey Institute of International Studies. During 1989 four instructors were awarded their master's degrees through this program, and another sixty-five were enrolled. Yet another form of professional development was attendance at academic conferences, and a few dozen teachers each year were funded to attend professional conferences such as the annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). Nineteen faculty members attended the annual ACTFL meeting in Boston in November 1989.*Educational Technology*

Educational Technology

The use of learning machines to revolutionize the educational process had long been a dream of educational reformers. The revolution in audio recording technology in the 1940s soon appeared in US Army Language School classrooms, where every student was issued a portable tape recorder for homework assignments and language labs were integrated into the daily schedule. DLIFLC experimented with computer-assisted instruction in the 1960s and 1970s, but the widespread introduction of computers into the foreign language classroom had to await the personal computer revolution of the 1980s. In the mid-1980s the Army adopted EIDS (Electronic Information Delivery System) as the standard Army-wide delivery vehicle for computer-based training and DLIFLC was involved early on in the process, adapting the system for its own use. Yet rapid changes in the computer industry made it clear that EIDS was not the best system for the special requirements of foreign language instruction.

Harnessing the power of computers for the classroom posed vastly different challenges than harnessing them for administrative use. The institute's leaders, charged with operating the largest foreign language training program in the federal government, remained alert for potential applications. But bringing the computer revolution home to the institute was easier said than done. The list of excuses was lengthy: the slow procurement process, the sheer size of the institute, the expense, the need for DoD-wide compatibility for exported course materials, and the need to retrain the faculty. The computer industry was changing at a bewildering pace, and the pedagogical issues were largely unexplored. For example, what role would the teacher play in the language classroom of the future? Would there be any role at all? Computers will not replace teachers, the provost had said more than

once, but teachers who use computers will replace teachers who do not.[20] Educational technology was listed as one component of the Proficiency Enhancement Plan, but the tone was cautious. DLIFLC had to chart a middle course through the computer revolution, not wasting tax dollars on risky ventures, but not missing out on the benefits offered by innovations. Like basic research in a high-tech manufacturing firm, investing in educational technology was a "cost of doing business" for the institute.

One way to chart a middle course was to study what was truly needed. For this the institute's Research Division contracted for a multi-year Educational Technology Needs Assessment by the Institute for Simulation and Training. This study examined potential applications of technology for both resident and nonresident training. During 1989 the study team provided DLIFLC with a detailed analysis of copyright issues associated with the use of video programming, upon which the institute was about to embark, and a survey of educational technology needs as perceived by individual DLIFLC staff members.[21]

Keeping the institute abreast of these challenges was the Educational Technology Division. In December 1988 the institute had hired Earl A. Schleske from the University of Minnesota to be the division's first civilian director. Under his leadership DLIFLC pressed ahead with putting EIDS to work. The first EIDS machines were placed in the Germanic School early in 1989. German VELVET, a prototype interactive video course developed several years before, was converted for EIDS and released to TRADOC for DoD-wide distribution, and a follow-on program, D-DISC, was started. The "Gulf to the Ocean" Arabic program was adapted for the Sony-made EIDS prototype the institute had received several years before. Course development projects for interactive videos in Greek and Turkish were contracted for through HumRRO International, Inc., and planning was begin for similar courseware for Spanish, Thai, and Tagalog. The Educational Technology Division staff worked on refining the Course Authoring System for teachers to develop their own materials on the EIDS machines, and several instructors were detailed to develop lessons and drills on the new machines.[22]

While the Army was committed to EIDS, Schleske quickly became convinced that EIDS technology was far from ideal for foreign language instruction and pushed for authorization to purchase a more capable system, the Apple Macintosh. When the Board of Visitors met in August they applauded the institute's efforts to stay at the cutting edge of technology and strongly endorsed the institute's bid to procure Macintoshs. When Colonel Fischer took command of the institute in August, he came in as a champion of educational technology and was easily sold on the value of the Macintosh. By the end of the year DLIFLC had procured thirty-two Macintosh SEs, and a number of short demonstration projects had been developed.

Other initiatives began to pay off during 1989, including the classroom use of live television broadcasts. Just as wartime Military Intelligence Service Language School students had listened to Japanese shortwave broadcasts and watched Japanese films, future students could watch videotapes of current news broadcasts from abroad. During 1989 DLIFLC tapped into a nation-wide

system that captured and rebroadcast foreign television programming, called SCOLA (Satellite Communications for Learning). The first two antennas were installed in September 1989, one at the School of Russian II, and one at the Educational Technology Division.

The institute was also actively pursuing the idea of doing its own television broadcasting, but this time in an interactive mode. The technology had existed for several years for delivering live, interactive instruction worldwide, but the Army was only using this for video teleconferencing to reduce administrative travel costs. In September 1989 DLIFLC launched a unique program using several Arabic instructors to teach a dozen Arabic linguists stationed at Fort Stewart, Georgia, and Fort Campbell, Kentucky. At first the video tele-conferencing center at Fort Ord was used to deliver the specially designed two-week, eighteen-hour refresher training program. The following year this blossomed into the video teletraining program with special contractor-provided equipment.[23]

With much high-level interest and support, DLIFLC was pursuing multiple options in educational technology as the decade came to a close. As older technology matured, training materials were developed and products were fielded for resident and nonresident use. As newer technologies appeared, DLIFLC tried them out. The circle of computer users at the institute and in the field was gradually expanding. In October 1989 a new assistant director, Lieutenant Colonel Sharon D. Richardson, USAF, replaced Lieutenant Colonel Helen Brainerd, USAF, in the Educational Technology Division. In November Schleske left DLIFLC after only one year and returned to the University of Minnesota, leaving Richardson as the acting director to continue his work.

Area Studies

During 1989 Area Studies continued to serve as advocate for the inclusion of cultural elements as a recognized component of the institute's language courses, an initiative that the office had pursued for several years. During 1989 Chaplain (Major) John Babcock, USA, took an extensive survey of the faculty and found they strongly supported the idea in principle.[24] The task for the office was to develop a standardized way of adding culture to the program of instruction.

The office was active in other ways as well. They brought guest speakers into the classrooms and launched a series of evening "Headline Seminars" on current topics. Babcock taught several classes in world religions and authored several articles in the *Globe*. The office also supported the DLI Pancultural Orchestra, which presented programs of world music several times each year. On the administrative side, the office was displaced for several months into a nearby building while Bldg. 277 underwent extensive renovation.

The director of Area Studies, Lieutenant Colonel James C. Wise, USA, devoted most of his attention to developing the Foreign Area Officer program, which he had begun in 1988. By 1989 the program had developed into several

components. In addition to basic language instruction, it included a one-week FAO orientation course, taught twice in 1989, a guest speaker program, a mentoring program by which FAO students were linked up with experienced FAOs on the institute's staff, and assistance with graduate school applications. At any given time DLIFLC had anywhere from fifty to ninety FAO students in training. Wise pushed the program even further during the year with the support of the FAO proponency office in Army ODCSOPS, including planning for two Reserve Component FAO Orientation Courses in 1990 and the establishment of a "FAONet" on the Army Forum system of computer bulletin boards.

Nonresident Training

Supporting military linguists after they graduate has always been one of the toughest challenges facing the institute. A toughly worded critique of the Army's foreign language program published in December 1988 stated flatly that DLIFLC did not have a "viable" nonresident program.[25] The institute's leaders had long put priority on the resident training program and had been generally unsuccessful in securing adequate resources to upgrade support to the field. This left the Nonresident Training Division in the position of shipping existing course materials to units that requested them. The division operated out of a quiet off-campus location in Pacific Grove under the leadership of Dave Olney. The master plan for nonresident training was completely reformatted in the revision of *A Strategy for Excellence*, but with no significant change in goals or strategies. In July 1989 when Olney was reassigned to become dean of the Asian School, his place was taken by Joe Yonan, formerly dean of the East European School.[26]

Changes were nevertheless being made. After several years of limited course development work, in October 1988 contractors began work on a new generation of nonresident courses. The Proficiency Improvement Courses in Czech, Polish, and Russian were written under contract through HumRRO International, Inc., and the institute monitored the quality of the end product through the Curriculum Division. Plans were made for courses in five additional languages. In addition to the Special Forces Functional Language Courses designed to be taught at Fort Bragg, the institute also supervised the writing of the Central Region Orientation Program-Egypt (CROP-E) mentioned above.

Outreach activities were coming into greater demand. In FY 1988 the institute had fielded ten mobile training teams, each of which provided usually two weeks of instruction using two or three instructors. In FY 1989 these rose to forty, and requests for many more could not be supported. While the requestors usually paid for the travel costs, DLIFLC received no additional staffing to support these trips, which in terms of instructor time, were all "out of hide." Furthermore, there was no formal mechanism in place for prioritizing, scheduling, or resourcing the trips. DLIFLC addressed these issues at the GOSC at its January 1990 meeting.

Colonel Fischer strongly felt the need to support linguists in the field. The Board of Visitors endorsed this emphasis when they put enhanced DLIFLC support to nonresident training at the top of their list of recommendations in August 1989. The basic components for a turnaround were already in place when Fischer arrived. The Educational Technology Needs Assessment research project began in March 1989 to look at the constellation of hardware and software issues that bore on the issue, and the Evaluation Division conducted an extensive evaluation of the US Forces Command language program. The managerial shortcomings that seemed endemic in the field led DLIFLC to develop a command language program manager workshop first held in November together with the Language Program Coordination Office. The institute also drafted a guidebook for command language program managers, published in January 1990 as DLIFLC Pamphlet 351-1, "Evaluation Guidelines for DoD Command Language Programs."

Early in the year several Arabic instructors designed and taught a special Sinai orientation program to more than 250 soldiers from the 7th Infantry Division (Light) at nearby Fort Ord who were slated to serve with the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO). The video teletraining pilot project described above was another example of the institute trying new approaches to an old problem. An entirely new way of doing the nonresident mission was slowly making itself felt.

Resident Training

The Resident Training Division had a difficult job to perform, or more accurately, many difficult jobs. Chief among them was scheduling students from all four services into hundreds of courses each year, tracking them until they graduated up to a year later, and providing statistical data on demand. "When I came down here to Resident Training," Major Paul J. Bisulca, USA, the division chief, later wrote, "the task was easy to understand (the execution was a bear)."[27] The division was not staffed to handle the workload, and to make matters worse, several additional chores fell to them by default. One was revising the controversial DLIFLC regulation on course development, DLIFLC Memorandum 5-2. Another was conducting graduation ceremonies. Yet another was providing staff support for the director of Training and Doctrine, who lacked an operations office. These mission and staffing questions were the subject of much discussion during 1989. The institute's Resource Management office studied them, as did the TRADOC Management Engineering Activity (TRAMEA), but nothing was resolved. The DLIFLC organization and functions manual continued to show the office divided into two separate divisions, the Program Management Division and the Academic Records and Scheduling Division.[28]

The bright spot during 1989 was the automation of the scheduling functions using ATRRS (Army Training Requirements and Resources System). All the student detachments came on line early in the year, and DLIFLC sponsored a users' conference in the spring. Using computers, the division was able to serve as a more effective gatekeeper to enforce the new minimum

DLAB entrance requirements for the basic courses (and DLPT minimums for intermediate and advanced courses) and to raise the seat fill rate to a record 96% for the year.

Program Evaluation, Research & Testing

Three key academic support functions were aligned under the Directorate of Program Evaluation, Research & Testing, the local name for what other TRADOC schools call the evaluation and standardization directorate. Three divisions, Testing, Evaluation, and Research, reported through Dr. John L. D. Clark directly to the commandant.[29]

Testing

The Testing Division, responsible for administering a DoD-wide system of foreign language tests, had moved in several new directions after Dr. Dariush Hooshmand was appointed its chief in 1988. After several years of work, the third generation of Defense Language Proficiency Tests, the DLPT III series, was wrapped up in 1989 with the completion of test batteries in six languages. Work was also begun in earnest on the DLPT IV series. The first prototype, the Russian DLPT IV, was first administered in August 1989. DLPT IV test-writing teams were assembled for several other languages.
The Testing Division also applied to the American Council on Education (ACE) in 1989 to evaluate the institute's testing programs for award of "credit by examination." An ACE evaluation team visited DLIFLC in September and subjected the institute's tests and procedures to a thorough examination and recommended that up to 36 academic credit hours be awarded both for the existing inventory of DLPT IIIs and the new generation of DLPT IVs.

Evaluation

The Evaluation Division under Dr. John A. Lett had several major initiatives underway in 1989. A new end-of-course student opinion questionnaire on program effectiveness (SOQ:PE) was implemented to supplement the questionnaire on instructional effectiveness (SOQ:IE). Other procedural and organizational changes were made to the SOQ program, including the direct administration of the questionnaires by Evaluation Division staff members.[30]
The division was also the institute's point of contact for the exchange of student information with the Goodfellow Technical Training Center, the "follow-on" school that three quarters of the institute's students attended immediately following graduation. Lack of communication between the two schools had led to problems in the past, and improving the relations with the sister school was a GOSC priority. The "feed-forward/feed-back" system as it matured during the year included sending individual student information such as DLPT scores to Goodfellow and receiving back information on student performance there. Overall the Evaluation Division concluded that "as a result of this information exchange, a considerable amount of 'fine-tuning' of

the instruction provided at both DLIFLC and GTTC has been possible, to the benefit of both institutions."[31]

The division also assisted with a variety of other projects inside and outside DLIFLC, such as the evaluation of the FORSCOM command language program mentioned above, and an evaluation of the cultural orientation program mentioned above for soldiers deploying to the Middle East.

Research

The Research Division, also headed by Lett, was created in 1984 as an in-house research capability with two objectives: "to improve the quality and efficiency of language training and to maintain and enhance performance of linguists in the field."[32] The division supervised two large research projects being conducted by contractors, as well as several smaller in-house research projects. The Educational Technology Needs Assessment (ETNA) has been described above. The Language Skill Change Project (LSCP) was launched in 1987 to study changes in student proficiency through their first term of service. Initial data on skill changes between graduation from DLIFLC and the completion of follow-on training were presented at the annual BILC meeting at Madrid in the summer of 1989.[33]

Conclusion

At the end of the decade DLIFLC was in ferment at all levels. The call to bring 80% of students in all languages to the 2/2 level within a few short years brought into sharp focus the need to overhaul every aspect of the academic process at the institute. In the nation's public schools this shift to a results-oriented view of education (as opposed to a process-oriented view) was lauded as a "paradigm shift."[34] At DLIFLC it led to a commitment at all levels to making changes, big and small. Many involved obvious factors such as replacing outdated textbooks and updating teaching methods. Some were truly innovative, such as using computers in the classrooms and video teletraining and changing the social organization of the schools with team teaching.

Most of all, the shift had to be student-centered. What made the education process at DLIFLC unique was its students. The young men and women who filled the institute's classroom had volunteered to serve in the armed forces, had been carefully selected for language study, and were placed in a controlled environment where they could focus on the study of their assigned language for up to a year or more. The accumulated experience of many years of teaching foreign languages had shown that the students had to be active participants in the process. Only thus could the drive for proficiency succeed.

Chapter Four
Foreign Language Learning
in 1989

A reporter from *Soldiers* Magazine who had studied Korean at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) in 1968 returned for a visit in 1989. Many things had stayed the same, he wrote, but much was different: "It's the students who seem to have changed." He described the regimen of physical training and military training that supple-mented classroom instruction. "Present-day DLI students act like soldiers," he wrote, and concluded that they were "smarter than we were, or at least more 'dedicated.'"[1]

His impressions were confirmed by test results, which showed that something had indeed changed. The quality of students coming to DLIFLC over the long term was gradually rising. The most obvious measure was the sharp decrease in the number of students arriving with low scores on the Defense Language Aptitude Battery (DLAB). By other measures the students were similar to their predecessors in recent years. Four-fifths were initial entry trainees in all four services, young people coming straight from basic training at the beginning of their first enlistments. As with their peers at colleges and universities, they were bright and full of energy. Many of them, like college students, were living away from home for the first time in their lives. Most were new to the discipline of military service and the discipline of learning a foreign language.

Student living conditions had changed as well. During the 1980s the institute had built several new dormitories, and by 1989 these had allowed the institute to close down temporary facilities at Lackland Air Force Base and the Presidio of San Francisco. In 1989, for the first time in nearly a decade, the commandant could directly oversee all of the students being taught under his auspices except for the small numbers being taught through the contract program, few of whom were initial entry trainees. In November work was begun on new barracks to house a few more students, but this was soon stalled by a DoD-wide moratorium on new construction.

To these students were added a leavening of more mature students, including noncommissioned officers and petty officers returning for intermediate, advanced, or specialized courses or officers enrolled in special training programs. A handful of students from non-DoD federal agencies and allied nations also attended classes, a growing market for the institute.

These students were supported by four troop units, one from each service. The largest was the US Army Troop Command, which coordinated many aspects of the troop units at the institute. In addition to routine personnel and administrative functions, these units also served to coordinate student support of major events at the institute such as Language Day and community events such as the Special Olympics. Most importantly, their support of the learning process was on the rise in 1989, with the encouragement of the new commandant. The students' leadership worked to reinforce

the lessons learned in the classroom through academic counselling, supervised study, remediation, and dozens of other ways.[2]

US Army Troop Command

Three out of every four students were assigned to the US Army Troop Command. On average 2,500 soldiers were studying languages at any given time during the year, although this varied from a low of less that 2,200 to over 2,800 at year's end. The commander, Lieutenant Colonel Donald B. Connelly, USA, organized them into seven student companies, six for enlisted students, staff sergeant and below, and one for officers and senior noncommissioned officers. Troop Command had a two-fold mission: "to assist DLI to accomplish its language training mission and provide common and MOS skill training which will ensure that all Army personnel assigned to DLI will be individually ready and fit to accomplish wartime tasks and missions." Connelly's guidance to his subordinate commanders was that this duality demanded "close coordination between the unit and the academic schools, departments, and instructors. We must collectively provide a balanced military academic climate which enables our soldiers to succeed and reach new levels of excellence within the Army."[3] In response to the reorganization of the language schools in the summer of 1989, Connelly reorganized his enlisted student companies, which involved shifting some barracks and units. Troop Command also coordinated barracks utilization with the other services.

The special Army "soldierization" training for initial entry training soldiers was a subject of concern during 1989. The TRADOC Soldierization Program was designed to extend beyond basic training, so Troop Command was tasked to provide common skills training, physical training, and other training and assessment during their studies. Most of these requirements were completed during the first four months at the institute, but many continued throughout. In January 1989 a TRADOC team headed by a brigadier general visited the institute to review Troop Command's training program, and when the TRADOC Deputy Commanding General for Training visited in February this was briefed as well.[4]

Another issue of concern was the overfill rate of Army students. An average of 150 students at any given time were waiting from one to five months for seats to open up due to scheduling and DLAB problems. This problem was not solved during the year.[5] The surplus of students was aggravated by the closure of the San Francisco branch, which boosted the Army student load at the Presidio of Monterey by 500. Troop Command remained concerned with the shortage of permanent party personnel, especially platoon sergeants.

Many of the administrative requirements for the support of Army students, as well as the permanent party staff, were handled by the Military Personnel Branch, which operated out of the new military personnel building, Taylor Hall. This branch, headed by CW2 Bill Young, USA, was under the control of the school secretary.[6] The special needs of US Army Reserve and National Guard students were handled by the Reserve Forces Office. In recent

years this function had been carried out by Lieutentant Colonel Ronald Gala-sinski, USA, and Sergeant Major Moreno, USA.

US Air Force 3483rd Student Squadron (ATC)

A smaller but still sizeable number of Air Force students came to DLIFLC each year to study foreign languages. About 550 airmen were in training at any given time. They were assigned to the 3483rd Student Squadron, which had a similar mission to the US Army Troop Command. This was one of five squadrons of the 3480th Student Group, which in turn fell under the 3480th Technical Training Wing of the Air Training Command. Since 1985 the squadron had been commanded by Major Robert C. Nethery, USAF. In July 1989 he was replaced by Major Bruce L. Betts, USAF.[7]

Administrative support was given by yet another office, under Command Master Sergeant Nunnemaker, USAF: Operating Location A, 323rd Air Base Group, headquartered at Mather Air Force Base, California.[8]

US Naval Security Group Detachment

An average of 325 sailors were studying at DLIFLC at any given time during 1989, under the control of the US Naval Security Group Detachment Monterey. The Navy presence was unmistakable, from the striking white sea anchors outside the detachment billets to two of the newest buildings at the institute which had been dedicated to sailor-linguists who had fallen in the line of duty: CTI3 (NAC) Patrick R. Price, USN, after whom the fitness center was named in January 1989, and Lieutenant Robert F. Taylor, USN, after whom the military personnel center was named in January 1990. Both were graduates of the DLIFLC Russian basic course, and the commander of Naval Security Group Command personally presided over both dedication ceremonies.

At the end of 1988 the detachment moved into new office space in Taylor Hall. In April 1989, Lieutenant Commander Thomas W. Hanneke, USN, turned over command of the detachment to Lieutenant Commander Kent H. Kraemer, USN, who had served in cryptologic assignments for many years both as an enlisted man and an officer. The most important administrative change was gaining quota management authority for all Navy students through the adoption of the Army Training Requirements and Resourcing System (ATRRS).[9]

US Marine Corps Administrative Detachment

The US Marine Corps assigned an average of 200 students to DLIFLC at any given time. The Marine Corps Administrative Detachment began the year with a new commander, when Major Richard Monreal, USMC, replaced Major James Rickard, USMC, on January 13. The detachment also became tied in with ATRRS to "allow on-site management of language quotas for the Marine Corps."[10]

Conclusion

At the end of 1989, Operation Just Cause came as a sobering reminder that DLIFLC was training *military* linguists, not just people who could speak other languages. Even as the end of the Cold War dawned, the transition from classroom to battlefield could be abrupt. This placed a special responsibility on the shoulders of the institute's students. They not only had to learn their lessons well, but to maintain their military skills and personal readiness to answer their nation's call at any time. Their predecessors had acquitted themselves well. The students of 1989 would have ample opportunity in the years ahead to show what they had learned.

Chapter Five
Sustaining Foreign Language Education
in 1989

The wide-ranging transformation of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) in the 1980s placed great demands upon the institute's support systems. The day-to-day sustainment of the institute's four hundred classrooms and more than eight hundred instructors was a daily challenge. Many people too numerous to mention made essential contributions to the final result, increasing student proficiency. Coping with growth and change added even more challenges. Some changes were major, such as the automation of most civilian personnel functions. Other seemingly minor changes, such as the end of the venerable Disposition Form, DA Form 2496, contributed to a sense of movement.

During 1989 the institute's complex sustainment systems were orchestrated by the chief of staff, Captain John A. Moore, USN, and the school secretary, Colonel Vladimir Sobichevsky, USA.[1] Not all the organizations and agencies that supported the institute's operations were under their direct control. For example, base operations support was provided by the authorities at Fort Ord, through the Presidio of Monterey garrison commander. During the first half of 1989 this was Colonel Bruce E. Wilson, USA. When he retired from the Army in July, he was replaced by Lieutenant Colonel Gerald J. Stratton, USA.

Managing Resources

The Directorate of Resource Management was responsible for the oversight of the institute's $48.3 million annual budget and the management of a continually evolving table of distribution and allowances, as well as dozens of other routine and not-so-routine staff functions. Little happened in the institute that did not have a resource impact in dollars or personnel. During 1989 the directorate was under the leadership of Major Randy R. Beckman, USA, and John Estep. In all areas Resource Management worked in close coordination with the TRADOC staff.[2] Resource Management also served as a strategic planning staff for the commandant as described in Chapter 2. They updated the master plan twice in 1989 and drafted the first long-range program and plan.

Managing Civilian Personnel

The Civilian Personnel Office (CPO) was in the midst of many changes during 1989 under the leadership of Brian Brummer. The more than 1,200 civilian employees were a constant challenge to managers. The CPO staff worked hard to keep up with the many changes of the year, professionally handling the reduction-in-force of ten low-density languages described in Chapter 2, and recruiting and hiring new instructors and staff in languages

with growing requirements. Providing quality personnel support for some 1,200 civilian employees took the efforts of the entire staff. To the already extensive employee training program was added extensive "AIDS in the Workplace" and "Prevention of Sexual Harassment" courses which were mandatory for all employees.[3]

Some of the personnel problems were beyond the power of the institute to correct on its own. Over the years the faculty and leadership of the institute had grown disenchanted with the civil service system as an effective system of personnel management for an educational institution. In 1986 the institute had proposed a New Personnel System, a "rank-in-person" system, to replace the civil service "rank-in-position" system. In the spring of 1989 it was written into the Proficiency Enhancement Plan as one of the five basic prerequisites for reaching the 80% 2/2 level. The Board of Visitors declared it "crucial to the long term viability of the DLI." Nevertheless during the year the proposal made little progress towards Congressional action. In July the leadership of the faculty union, Local 1263 of the National Federation of Federal Employees, spoke out against it forcefully. The following month the Civilian Personnel Office devoted a special issue of *The DLI Manager* to a detailed description of the proposed changes, and over the next few months both sides worked to smooth over their differences. In November the new commandant established a joint union-management task force chaired by the assistant commandant.

To increase the efficiency of the office's routine personnel actions in the fall they made the big jump to the Army Civilian Personnel System (AC-PERS), a new system of hardware and software that automated many functions. The entire staff had tobe trained on the system, and personnel records had to be transferred.[4] At the end of the year the previous Civilian Personnel Officer, Robert Snow, announced his return from an assignment in Germany, and Brummer was selected for a position at the US Army Personnel Command in Alexandria, Virginia.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Office continued under the leadership of F. Kathryne Burwell. Late in 1988 her office received high marks from the Department of the Army Compliance & Complaints Review Agency, and the complaint resolution activities and special emphasis programs contributed to providing a work environment in which faculty and staff could strive for professional excellence.[5]

Managing Information

The flood of new computers and software that poured into DLIFLC during 1989 presented both opportunities and problems. The *Information Systems Plan for Strategic Alignment* (1988), the result of a major staff study, called for the institute to establish a corporate database and to work towards tying all managers together through a single computer network. Over the winter of 1988-89 an second team prepared an implementation study, which it called a "road map" for the future of information management at DLIFLC. A long-range plan was certainly needed. The institute had over 500 personal computers on its property book at the beginning of the year, over half of which

were for administrative or course development work, and more were arriving each month. In September the institute was connected to the Army-wide PROFS system for electronic mail and four laptops were received.[6]

The director of Information Management, David J. Shoemaker, worked to give some clear direction to this rapid change. Meanwhile his staff had to deal with the mundane as well as the futuristic. For several months they had to work out of makeshift office space while Bldg. 277 underwent a major renovation. Shoemaker spelled out his intent to create a comprehensive information management system for the institute in several places, including an article in *Army Communicator*. On the one hand, he interpreted his charter broadly, trying to exercise oversight authority over all information management areas, including those not under his direct supervision. On the other hand he worked to push responsibility for systems down to the functional area managers. He also continued to work to fend off attempts to consolidate the information management functions with Fort Ord. The results of his planning and staff work would not be apparent for years to come.[7]

Managing Facilities

The institute continued to use a mix of old and new facilities during 1989. The construction master plan was nearing completion, but was forced into a pause during 1989 due to contract problems with the Phase III barracks project and a moratorium on new construction. The last two major buildings in the plans were postponed indefinitely, an auditorium and the third new classroom building, known as the General Instructional Facility III. In November, Undersecretary of the Army John W. Shannon visited the institute for an update on the expansion plans.

Overall base operations support remained a sore point between DLIFLC and the authorities at Fort Ord responsible for the upkeep of the facilities. The acting commandant lodged at least one formal complaint in February. The low level of funding and staffing for base operations support was compounded by the extended drought being experienced in the area, then in its third year. Early in the year the Monterey Water District asked the Army to cut water useage on the Presidio by 20%.

The institute was nevertheless able to put on an impressive showing for the annual TRADOC Community of Excellence competition in June. Munakata Hall was given a landscaping facelift. The institute walked off with first prize in the category of TRADOC activities on non-TRADOC installations. The new fitness center and dining facility received separate awards.[8]

Under the chief of facilities management, Jerry Abeyta, the institute invested over $800,000 during the year in numerous renovation and upgrade projects. Seven classroom and administrative buildings were renovated, in part to absorb the departments moved down from San Francisco at the end of 1988. Five buildings were given major electrical upgrades to handle more computer equipment, and the lobbies of seven more, including the headquarters building, were given a facelift. The Corps of Engineers Research Lab conducted a major study of space utilization at the institute as well.[9]

On October 17, 1989, a major earthquake struck Northern California, with its epicenter only forty miles from the Presidio of Monterey. Both old and new facilities rode out the temblor with hardly a scratch, although electric power was lost for nearly 24 hours. The workers who had built an Army post on the Monterey Peninsula had built to last. Only time would tell if the institute would withstand with equal success the international and domestic shocks of the coming decade.

Other Support Functions

Any organization the size and complexity of DLIFLC had a host of supporting staff offices and individuals too numerous to mention. Many of these handled unique functions that did not fit into one of the major categories listed above. Their contributions nevertheless were immense.

-- The Inspector General for the institute was Major Douglas Clark, USA. Clark and his staff conducted investigations and responded to complaints from both military and civilian personnel.[10]

-- The Administrative Support Division under the adjutant, Captain David A. Donathan, USA, provided general administrative support to the command group and staff.[11]

-- The Public Affairs Officer, Major Henry R. Hebert, USA, was responsible for community relations, public affairs, and publishing the DLIFLC *Globe*, the institute's biweekly in-house organ.[12]

-- The Protocol Officer, Pierette Harter, was responsible for making arrangements for the hundreds of visitors to the institute each year. This office was also responsible for organizing several major functions during the year, such as the annual meeting of the General Officer Steering Committee and the Board of Visitors.[13]

-- The Command Historian, James C. McNaughton, published his second annual command history in the spring of 1989 covering the events of 1987.[14]

-- A new Security Officer, James Woodruff, was hired in January 1989. He quickly began to improve the management procedures within the office and published a new DLIFLC Regulation 380-1, "DLIFLC Security Program" (1 Feb 89).[15]

-- Many changes continued to take place in the field of logistics under the Fred Koch as chief of logistics and Dave Curran as property book officer. The institute enjoyed an increase in funding for supplies and equipment during FY 1989, much of which went into purchases of computer hardware and software. DLIFLC Memo 700-1, "Logistical Support," was reissued on 1 July 1989, the first revision since 1984. This was supplemented by *Logist-o-Gram* newsletters, published in March, July, and October. Service to students was improved in June by the movement of the Central Issue Point for student textbooks, tape recorders, and other items into Bldg. 517.[16]

-- The organization for audiovisual support at DLIFLC was the result of a commercial activities review concluded in 1986. Most audiovisual services were picked up by The Big Picture Company, Inc., beginning in April 1987.

Two years later DLIFLC continued to have an audiovisual management office, headed by Allen M. Merriman, who was also the contracting officer's representative. The full range of audiovisual services was provided by the contractors (later renamed The Source AV, Inc.) for an annual cost of $760,000 under manager Wanda Straw. Merriman also published a *Quarterly Audiovisual Information Bulletin.*[17]

-- The Production Coordination Office continued to oversee the printing and duplication of course materials. Barbara Driscoll implemented a new computerized order processing system during the year. She left the position in November.[18]

-- The print plant continued to operate under the leadership of Michael Southard.[19]

A responsive support system remained essential for the drive for excellence in the eight language schools. It would become even more important in the future as the institute had to react quicker than ever before. New challenges lay ahead for the skilled and dedicated workers in the administrative and logistics field.

Conclusion

Training military linguists has always been a vital part of the overall mission of the Department of Defense to safeguard our nation and its allies. The process by which this training is provided can be looked at from several angles: the overall requirements and policy environment, in this case the Defense Foreign Language Program; the internal management of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center; the institute's academic programs; the students themselves; and the administrative and logistics systems that support resident language training.

At the end of the decade of the 1980s, each of these areas was undergoing change. As the international scene was being transformed, the institute was undergoing a simultaneous process of self-renewal aiming at producing better military linguists than ever before.

At the beginning of the decade of the 1990s, journalists hailed the advent of the Post-Cold War era, and political analysts predicted a "new world order" in which nations could develop together in peace. Their hopes were soon dashed by a new outbreak of war in the Middle East, which led to Operation Desert Storm, the largest deployment of American military might since World War II. The result was a new challenge for military linguists and the training base that produced and sustained them. The requirements for military linguists had grown more urgent than ever before, and Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center would be called upon to meet ever new challenges. That it was ready to meet these challenges was due to the hard work and careful planning of 1989 and the many years that went before.

Notes

Chapter One:
The Defense Foreign Language Program in 1989

1. George A. Carver, Jr., "Intelligence in the Age of Glasnost," *Foreign Affairs* (Summer 1990), 148.
2. Carver, 157.
3. Army Regulation 350-20/OPNAVINST 1550.7B/Air Force Regulation 50-40/Marine Corps Order 1550.4D, "Management of the Defense Foreign Language Program," 15 Mar 87.
4. ATFL-NCR, memo, subj: DFLP Action Officer Meeting Highlights, 13 Apr 89.
5. Figure provided by DLIFLC Resource Management Directorate, Resource Advisory Subcommittee (RASC) Meeting, 7 Nov 89.
6. Annual Program Review, 23 Jan 90, Tab B. GOSC Briefing Book, 25 Jan 90, Tab D.
7. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC), Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 1.
8. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) ad hoc General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 18 May 1989, 1.
9. ATFL-EST, memo, subj: Time Lag in Getting Defense Language Proficiency Tests to Field Testing Sites, 17 Apr 89.
10. ATFL-NCR, memo, subj: DFLP Rump GOSC Highlights, 19 May 89. See also Summary Report, 18 May 89.
11. GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 3.
12. ATFL-NCR, memo, subj: DFLP Action Officer Meeting Highlights, 13 Apr 89.
13. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) ad hoc General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 18 May 1989, 13 Jun 89.
14. GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 2.
15. Annual Program Review, Jan 90, Tab B: Review and Analysis Quarterly Report, 4th Q FY 89, 12 Dec 89 NCR memo, review of history of DLIFLC implementation of ATRRS.
16. DAMO-TRO, msg, 130830Z Jul 89, subj: Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) Training Requirements, FY 91 and FY 92.
17. GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 3.
18. ATFL-NCR, memo, subj: Cryptologic Language Training Conference, 6 Apr 89.
19. DAMO-TRO, msg, subj: Refresher and Enhancement Foreign Language Training, 282045Z Feb 89; NSACSS, msg, subj: Cryptologic Linguist Proficiency Standard, 241939Z Mar 89.
20. ATFL-NCR, memo, subj: DFLP Rump GOSC Highlights, 19 May 89.
21. GOSC Briefing Book, 25 Jan 90, Tab M; GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 13-15. For the first year of OSIA language training, see *DLIFLC 1988 Annual Command History*, October 1990, 1-5 and 35-36.
22. Conversation Record, LTG Crosby (TRADOC DCGT) with Col. Cowger (DLIFLC A/C), 31 May 89.
23. GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 13. For similar discussion, see GOSC Summary Report, 18 May 90, 5.

24. Msg, DAMO-TRO, 282052Z Apr 89, subj: Shortfalls in Special Operations Forces (SOF) Language Capabilities.

25. DJCS, memo, 5 Jan 88[89], subj: Master Plan to Remedy Shortfalls in Language Capabilities.

26. Info Paper, ASOF-OPT-L, subj: Special Operations Forces Command Language Program (CLP), 7 Jun 89. DLIFLC Long-Range Plan and Program, FY 1990-2007, May 89.

27. DAMO-TRO, msg, 171856Z Nov 89, subj: 9 Nov 89 Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) Action Officer (AO) Meeting; restated in GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90.

28. ATFL-W, memo, subj: Article on Special Forces Training, 3 Aug 89.

29. Carver, 158.

30. GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 20 & 4.

31. GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 19; GOSC briefing book, 25 Jan 90, Tab S.

32. DIA, msg, 131800Z Mar 89; GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 18.

33. GOSC Briefing Book, 25 Jan 90, Tab G.

34. "Not cost effective:" "Department of Defense Study of Foreign Language Training Provided for Department of Defense Personnel and Their Dependents Worldwide," 10 Jul 64, 76; "may be ineffective:" General Accounting Office, *Need to Improve Language Training Programs and Assignments for U.S. Government Personnel Overseas*, 22 Jan 73; "disjointed:" TRADOC Inspector General, "General Inspection, FY 87, of Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center," Jun 87.

35. GOSC Briefing Book, 25 Jan 90, Tab D, Encl. 5; and GOSC Summary Report, 25 Jan 90, 12-13.

36. [ATFL-W], information paper, subj: Language Teams of US Air Force Intelligence Agency Reservists, 31 Jan 89.

37. ATFL-DRO, information paper, subj: DLIFLC Support to Drug Enforcement Administration, 8 Jan 90, included at Tab N to GOSC briefing book, 25 Jan 90.

Chapter Two:
Managing the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center in 1989

1. Report of the Second Meeting of the Defense Language Institute Board of Visitors, 16-17 August 1989.

2. See the *DLIFLC 1988 Annual Command History* (October 1990), 22.

3. CSM Beale interview, 29 Mar 89. The command sergeant major authorization was transferred to US Army Troop Command later in the year and SGM Cardenas took over as noncommissioned officer in charge of the adjutant's office.

4. See the *DLIFLC 1988 Annual Command History* (October 1990), 19-20.

5. Quoted in James Q. Wilson, *Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It* (New York: Basic Books, 1989), 196.

6. Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-80, *Executive Leadership* (19 Jun 87), especially Chapter 2.

7. Field Manual 22-103, *Leadership and Command at Senior Levels* (June 1987), 7.

8. Cover letter, 6 Jun 89. This edition, dated January 1989, was released in June 1989.

9. ATFL-RMB, Fiscal Year 1989 Cost Review, 2 Feb 90; ATFL-RM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries [Spring 1990].

10.   The turnback was explained by the director of Resource Management at the 7 Nov 89 meeting of the Resource Advisory Subcommittee. See also ATFL-W, memo, subj: Money, 28 Sep 89, which reported that Brigadier General Lehowicz "literally was stunned" when DLI-FLC returned $921,000, and he felt that this reflected poorly on the "middle management" at the institute.

11.   ATFL-CS, memo, subj: Minutes of the Resource Advisory Subcommittee (RASC) Meeting, 16 Nov 89.

12.   *DLIFLC Globe* (March 15, 1989), 4.

13.   ATFL-AC, memo, subj: Union Grievance Concerning Low-Priority Languages, 12 Jun 89.

14.   Civilian Personnel Management Policy and Procedure No. 351-1, 1 Apr 89. See also "Low-Density Language Closures: Concerns," *DLIFLC Globe* (15 Jun 89), 4, 10.

15.   ATFL-CP, memo, subj: Calendar Year 1989 Input to the DLIFLC Annual Historical Summary, 20 Apr 90. *Presidian* (Oct 89), 2.

16.   ATFL-RM, Quarterly Review and Analysis reports.

17.   ATFL-W, memo, subj: Amalgamation of Washington and Language Program Coordination Offices, 2 Dec 89.

18.   COL Fischer interview, 8 Mar 90.

19.   ATFL-CMT, memo, subj: Change of Command Transition, General Considerations, no date [Aug 89] with attached undated memo, "Points of Emphasis for Col Fischer."

20.   Quoted in Field Manual 22-103, *Leadership and Command at Senior Levels* (June 1987), 28.

21.   COL Fischer interview, 8 Mar 90; notes, Transition Workshop, 14-15 Aug 89; notes, Transition Meeting, 21 Sep 89.

22.   "Vision 90 for DLI (Control Draft)" [Sep 89].

Chapter Three:
Foreign Language Teaching in 1989

1.   DLIFLC, *Accreditation Self-Study Report* (Feb 89); Outbriefing, 5 Apr 89.

2.   For the Proficiency Enhancement Plan, see DAMO-TRO, memo, subj: Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 26 January 1989, 13 Mar 89; DLIFLC, "Proficiency Enhancement Plan," May 89; DAMO-TRO, memo, subj: Summary Report for 18 May 1989, 13 Jun 89; ATFL-NCR, memo, subj: DFLP Rump GOSC Highlights, 19 May 89; Briefing presented to Board of Visitors on 16 Aug 89, slides included as enclosure to DLI Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Second Meeting of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Board of Visitors, 17 Aug 89; Briefing presented to GOSC on 25 Jan 90, slides included in GOSC briefing book, Tab D.

3.   ATFL-LPC, info paper, subj: Status of Cryptologic (CTS) Final Learning Objectives (FLO), 8 Jan 90, included in briefing book for 25 Jan 90 GOSC meeting, Tab L.

4.   For a key policy statement on mentors, see the Provost's School Staff Meeting minutes for 26 Sep 89.

5.   Dr. Clifford, briefing presented to Board of Visitors on 16 Aug 89, DLI Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Second Meeting of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Board of Visitors, 17 Aug 89, A-2; DLIFLC Memorandum 351-10, "Grading Policy," 1 April 1989. Most DLIFLC memos in the 350 and 351 series were reissued between Oct 88 and Apr 89.

6.   ATFL-DCE, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1989, 1 May 90. See also Herzog's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

7.   ATFL-DKO-AC, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1989, 20 Apr 90.

8.   See also Cole's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

9.   See De La Selva's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

10.   ATFL-DRO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Report of the School of Romance Languages for 1989, no date. See also Armbrust's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

11.   ATFL-DR1-AD, memo, subj: School of Russian Language (DR1) Annual Historical Summary, 17 Apr 90. ATFL-RU1, memo, subj: RU1 Objectives, 10 Feb 89. See also Solgalow's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

12.   ATFL-DR2-AC, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for DR2 (School of Russian Studies) Calendar Year 1989; and "First OSIA Intermediate Class Graduates from the Institute," *Globe* (30 Nov 89), 5. See also Vorobiov's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

13.   ATFL-DSL, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1989, 23 May 90. See also Leaver's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

14.   This change was not incorporated into DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89. See Golphenee's briefing at the commandant's transition workshop, 14 Aug 89.

15.   Proficiency Enhancement Plan, May 89, 4.

16.   DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 11-3g; ATFL-VPC, memo, Annual Historical Summaries for 1989, 13 Apr 90. See also the sections on curriculum development in DLIFLC's national report to the 1989 BILC conference, pages 3-4.

17.   "DLI's Electronic Publishing Gets New Training Center," *Globe* (12 Dec 89), 15.

18.   Proficiency Enhancement Plan, May 89, 3. See Tab B for language-by-language faculty training goals.

19.   DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 11-3c.; ATFL-VPF, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary for CY 1989, 19 Mar 90.

20.   Remarks at the conference, "Improving Foreign Language Teaching Through Technology," held at DLIFLC on 29-30 Oct 90. See Clifford's remarks published in the conference proceedings March 1991, p. 9.

21.   Briefing presented to Board of Visitors on 16 Aug 89, slides included as enclosure to DLI Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Second Meeting of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Board of Visitors, 17 Aug 89; ATFL-ES, memo, subj: 1989 Annual Report, 7 Jun 90.

22.   DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 11-3d.; ATFL-VPT, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary Submission, 20 Apr 90. For comprehensive reviews of the state of educational technology at DLIFLC in 1989, see ATFL-VPT, memo, subj: Outlook and Plan for Use of Present and Emerging Technologies in the Research, Development, Design and Implementation of Computer-based Educational Technology Systems at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, included at Tab M to the January 1989 GOSC briefing book; ATFL-VPT, talking paper, subj: DLIFLC's Educational Technology Program, 15 Nov 89; and ATFL-VPT, information paper, subj: Educational Technology Plans, Initiatives, and Milestones, 8 Jan 90, included as Tab T to the January 1990 GOSC briefing book. For a description of how German instructors adapted EIDS for the Final Learning Objectives program, see Helma Zeuge, "German FLO Goes EIDS," *Dialog on Language Instruction*, VI, 1 & 2 (1990), 97-101.

23. ATFL-TDN, memo, subj: Input for Annual Historical Summary, 20 Apr 90. See also "DLI Language Training Bounces Off Satellite," *Globe* (30 Nov 89), 6.

24. ATFL-TDS, memo, subj: 1989 Annual Historical Summary - Area Studies, 19 Apr 90; and ATFL-TDS, memo, subj: Analysis of Area Studies Questionnaire, 11 Sep 89.

25. Colonel Wesley A. Groesbeck, "Our Burgeoning Linguistics Gap," *Army* (December 1988), 26.

26. ATFL-TDN, memo, subj: Input for Annual Historical Summary, 20 Apr 90. See also the briefing slides included in the January 1990 GOSC briefing book, Tab D-5, and the remarks of LTC Golphenee and Dr. Clifford at the 14 Aug 89 commandant's transition workshop.

27. ATFL-TDR, memo, subj: Comments on the Draft TDR Management Study, 28 Aug 89. See also his detailed description of the division's activities during 1989, Resident Training Division, History for CY 1989, 30 Mar 90.

28. See ATFL-TD, memo, subj: Management Study of the Program Management Division and Academic Records and Scheduling Division, 8 Dec 89.

29. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, Chapter 13, 1 May 89, and ATFL-ES, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary - CY89, 7 Jun 90. See also Dr. Clark's briefing at commandant's transition workshop, 15 Aug 89.

30. See for example the Evaluation Division's presentation of SOQ data at the Quarterly Review and Analysis for 3rd Quarter FY 1989, 23 Aug 89, and for 4th Quarter FY 1989, 8 Nov 89.

31. ATFL-ES, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summary - CY89, 7 Jun 90. See also CTSRepDLIFLC, info paper, subj: Feedforward/Feedback: DLIFLC/Goodfellow TTC (GTTC), 2 Jan 89[90], at Tab R to Jan 90 GOSC Briefing Book.

32. Board of Visitors on 16 Aug 89, DLI Board of Visitors, memo, subj: Second Meeting of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center Board of Visitors, 17 Aug 89.

33. John A. Lett, Jr., "Direction and Extent of Post-DLIFLC Language Skills Change and Related Variables," paper presented at BILC conference, Madrid, Spain, 28 Jun 89, and published in the conference report, 73-129.

34. Chester E. Finn, Jr., "The Biggest Reform of All," *Phi Delta Kappan* (Apr 90), 584-92.

Chapter Four:
Foreign Language Learning in 1989

1. Tom Kiddoo, "Speaking in Tongues," *Soldiers* (November 1989, 44-46. See also "'68 DLI Grad Impressed by Growth, Changes Here," *Globe* (28 Feb 89).

2. See for example ATFL-CS, memo, subj: Student Remediation, Consolidation of Inputs, 6 Apr 89.

3. See ATFL-TPC, memo, subj: FY89 Training Guidance, 15 Aug 88. See also DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, paras. 14-2 and 14-3.

4. See ATFL-TPC, info paper, subj: Troop Command Soldierization Program, 5 Mar 90, included as an enclosure to ATFL-TPC, memo, subj: Troop Command Annual Historical Summary for 1989, 9 May 1990. See also LTC Connelly's briefing to the commandant's transition workshop, 15 Aug 89.

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

6. See DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 8-3b.

7. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 1989, para. 14-4c. See also Maj. Betts' briefing to the commandant's transition workshop, 15 Aug 89.

8. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 14-4d.

9. Naval Security Group Detachment Monterey, memo, subj: Command History 1989, 17 May 90. See also LCDR Kraemer's briefing to the commandant's transition workshop, 15 Aug 89.

10. Marine Corps Detachment, subj: Annual Historical Summary for 1989, 16 May 90. 10-1, para 14-4b. See also Maj. Monreal's briefing to the commandant's transition workshop, 15 Aug 89; and MCAD, memo, subj: Data Brief Sheet, 12 Oct 89.

Chapter Five:
Supporting Foreign Language Education in 1989

1. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, paras. 3-2c and 8-2.

2. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, Chapter 4. and ATFL-RM, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries [1989]; DLIFLC Command Operating Budget for FY 90, 1 Jun 89; and ATFL-RMB, Fiscal Year 1989 Cost Review, 2 Feb 90.

3. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, Chapter 7; ATFL-CP, memo, subj: Calendar Year 1989 Input to the DLIFLC Annual Historical Summary, 20 Apr 90; and ATFL-CPM, memo, subj: AIDS in the Workplace Policy Update, 23 Aug 89.

4. ATFL-CP, memo, subj: Implementation of the Army Civilian Personnel System (ACPERS) at DLI, 21 Aug 89; and ACPERS On-Site Training Manual, 3 Oct 89.

5. ATFL-EEO, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1989, 25 Apr 90. See also DLIFLC, "Multi-Year Affirmative Action Employment Program Plan, 1989 Accomplishment Report and 1990 Update."

6. DLIFLC, *Information Systems Plan for Implementation*, 28 Feb 89, App. F.

7. "The Changing DOIM," *Army Communicator* (Winter 1989), 38-39; *A Strategy for Excellence* (Jan 89), "Create a comprehensive information management system," page II-22A-1; ATFL-IM, memo, subj: "Command Policy #8-89, Staff Oversight of Information Mission Area (IMA) Disciplines," 10 Aug 89; ATFL-IM, info paper, subj: Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) Request for Exception to Single Director of Information Management (DOIM), 5 Mar 90, included in briefing book for GEN Foss (7 Mar 90), Tab J.

8. "Let's Give Ourselves a Round of Applause," *Globe* (30 Jun 89); "Defense Language Institute Awarded Commander's First-Place TCOE Trophy," *Globe* (12 Dec 89), 12-13.

9. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 8-3d. For a summary of facilities improvements in 1989, see *A Strategy for Excellence* (Jan 90), page II-18-1.

10. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 3-2h; and ATFL-IG, memo, subj: Annual Historical Summaries for 1989, 20 Feb 90.

11. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 3-3a.

12. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 3-2i.

13. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 3-2g; and ATFL-PRO, Historical Report, 30 Mar 90.

14. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 3-2k.

15. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 8-3c; and ATFL-SSS, memo, subj: [Annual Historical Summary for 1989], n.d.

16. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 8-3e.

17. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 8-3f.

18. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 8-3g; *A Strategy for Excellence* (Jun 89), II-22B-1.
19. DLIFLC Memo 10-1, 1 May 89, para. 6-4.

Glossary

ACE	American Council on Education
ACPERS	Army Civilian Personnel System
ACTFL	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
ATC	Air Training Command
ATRRS	Army Training Requirements and Resources System
BILC	Bureau for International Language Coordination
CLP	Command Language Program
COPE	Cultural Orientation Program for Egypt
CPO	Civilian Personnel Office
CROP-E	Central Region Orientation Program-Egypt
CTICM	Cryptologic Technician (Interpretive) Senior Master Chief
CTS	Cryptologic Training System
DCST	Deputy Chief of Staff for Training
D-DISC	Deutsch Disc for Interactive Courses
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
ETNA	Educational Technology Needs Assessment
FAO	Foreign Area Officer
FLO	Final Learning Objective
FLTCE	Foreign Language Training Center, Europe
FORSCOM	Forces Command
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
FY	Fiscal year, 1 October to 30 September
GFAB	Goodfellow Air Force Base
GTTC	Goodfellow Technical Training Center, San Angelo, Texas
GOSC	General Officer Steering Committee
GS-9, etc.	General Schedule grade levels
HUMINT	Human Intelligence
ICSFLC	Intelligence Community Staff Foreign Language Committee
ILR	Interagency Language Roundtable
INF	Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces
INSCOM	US Army Intelligence and Security Command
ISP	Information Systems Plan
LSCP	Language Skill Change Project

L-1, etc.	Listening comprehension level on ILR scale
MATFL	Master of Arts in the Teaching of Foreign Languages
MFO	Multinational Force and Observers
MLI	Military Language Instructor
MOLINK	Moscow-Washington Communications Link
MOS	Military Occupational Speciality
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Alliance
NAVSECGRUCOM	Naval Security Group Command
NCO	Noncommissioned officer
NCS	National Cryptologic School
NFFE	National Federation of Federal Employees
NSA	National Security Agency
NSGD	Naval Security Group Detachment - Monterey
OACSI	Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (Air Force)
OASA(MRA)	Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs
OASD(C3I)	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence
ODCSINT	Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence (Army)
ODCSOPS	Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Planning (Army)
OSIA	On-Site Inspection Agency
PIC	Proficiency Improvement Course
PROFS	Professional Office System
RIF	Reduction-in-force
R-1, etc.	Reading comprehension level on the ILR scale
SIGINT	Signals Intelligence
SMDR	Structure Manning Decision Review
SOF	Special Operations Forces
SOQ:IE	Student Opinion Questionnaire: Instructional Effectiveness
SOQ:PE	Student Opinion Questionnaire: Program Effectiveness
S-1, etc.	Speaking proficiency level on the ILR scale
TLSI	Technical Language Systems, Inc.
TRADOC	US Army Training and Doctrine Command
TRAMEA	TRADOC Management Engineering Activity
UFR	Unfinanced requirement
USA	US Army
USAF	US Air Force
USMC	US Marine Corps
USN	US Navy

Document List

1. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 26 January 1989, 13 Mar 89.
2. Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP) General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) Summary Report for 18 May 1989, 13 Jun 89.
3. DLIFLC Memorandum 10-1, Organization and Functions: Defense Langu-age Institute Foreign Language Center, 1 May 89.
4. DLIFLC, *Recapitulation of Student Input for Fiscal Year 1989*, Standardized Student Record System (SSRS), 25 Oct 89.
5. DLIFLC, *A Strategy for Excellence* (Jan 89).
6. DLIFLC, *Accreditation Self-Study Report* (Feb 89).
7. DLIFLC, *Information Systems Plan for Implementation* (Feb 89).
8. DLIFLC, *Proficiency Enhancement Plan* (May 89).
9. DLIFLC, *Annual Report*, BILC Conference (Jun 89).
10. DLIFLC, *Fiscal Year 1989 Cost Review* (2 Feb 90).
11. DLIFLC Staff Directory (Jun 89).
12. DLIFLC Staff Directory (Oct 89).

Note: The above listed documents are published in a separate volume available for review in the historical office.

Index