

DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

DLIFLC Pamphlet
Number 351-1

28 November 1995

Sustaining
FIELD ASSISTANCE VISIT (FAV) CONCEPT AND EVALUATION
GUIDELINES FOR DOD COMMAND LANGUAGE
PROGRAMS

1. INTRODUCTION: Two of the eight subsets of the overall DLIFLC mission require DLIFLC "to assist supported agencies in determining and validating their personnel language training requirements, [and] to support and evaluate worldwide command language programs." Desert Storm and Restore Hope experiences confirm the crucial need for a solid, on-going linguist sustainment and enhancement program at the individual post and command levels to ensure that potentially perishable linguist skills are maintained and improved over time. As the proponent for the Defense Foreign Language Program (DFLP), the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) has responsibility for providing assistance to commanders and other installation personnel in planning, developing, and implementing a unit command language program (CLP). This includes the responsibility for on-site evaluation of unit CLPs.

2. PURPOSE: This pamphlet succinctly describes what DLIFLC has found to be very useful and practical guidelines or questions-to-be-addressed in planning and implementing a high quality command language program in the field environment. It also outlines the concept of operations and the importance of Field Assistance Visits (FAVs) and the role that DLIFLC plays in reporting and tracking recommendations made during the FAV process. Many of the points outlined below are derived from FAVs conducted to Command Language Programs throughout the DoD, with much meaningful feedback provided by language-training managers.

3. REFERENCES: See Appendices A through E.

4. BACKGROUND: DLIFLC Field Assistance Visits (FAVs) with teams consisting of members from Operations, Plans and Programs, and Evaluation and Standardization, identified the lack of a standardized process for assessing the quality or product of linguist sustainment and enrichment programs in the field. The FAV process also identified the requirement for a standardized reporting procedure to provide a timely response to unit needs.

5. SCOPE: This pamphlet applies to all DLIFLC elements involved in the FAV process to include organizations conducting the FAV and those responsible for responding to recommendations deriving from the FAV process.

6. POLICIES

a. Field Assistance Visit (FAV). The intent of the DLIFLC FAV is to assist field units from all services in establishing and enhancing a Command Language Program (CLP).

b. Concept of Operations. FAV teams will consist of at least one member from OPP, ESE, and the Faculty and Staff Division (FS). FAV TDYs should consist of no more than three work days on-site. To maximize travel time and costs, two or more FAV trips will be coordinated for the same TDY whenever possible.

7. RESPONSIBILITIES

a. Proponency and Programs.

- (1) Coordinating the TDY to meet the unit's request.
- (2) Scheduling the TDY with FAV members.
- (3) Assessing unit needs prior to the TDY.
- (4) Assessing unit needs on-site.
- (5) Promoting DLIFLC services.
- (6) Reviewing unit language Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).
- (7) Conducting FAV pre- and post-briefs with the Commandant.
- (8) Preparing in-depth FAV trip reports.
- (9) Maintaining the FAV budget.

b. Evaluation and Standardization.

- (1) Developing a summary report on the FAV trip using criteria outlined in this regulation.
- (2) Tracking reports and recommendations.
- (3) Serving as a focal point for required responses and suspenses.

c. Faculty and Staff.

- (1) Training in Instructional Methodology.
- (2) Training in Computer Assisted Studies.
- (3) Training in Course Development.

d. All team members.

(1) Performing data analysis and on-site visits of major language sustainment programs as requested to objectively evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs in achieving DoD linguist goals.

(2) Providing timely, accurate feedback to local commanders and their staffs, as well as to interested up-channel echelons, on linguist sustainment and enhancement efforts.

(3) Providing on-site commanders with a detailed list of findings and recommendations in areas where improvements might be needed.

8. REPORTS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS: The following outlines the contents, to include follow-up actions required, of FAV trip and action tracking reports.

a. Each report should contain the following major and sub-categories.

(1) Identification of the unit(s) visited, date of visit, and personnel conducting the FAV.

(2) A short description of the overall purpose of the FAV from the perspectives of both DLIFLC and the unit visited.

(3) An itinerary, if provided by the unit visited, and a list of personnel contacted during the FAV. (If both the itinerary and list of personnel contacted are too voluminous to include in the body of the report, provide attachments to the main report.)

(4) A summary of observations and recommendations with the appropriate DLIFLC office responsible for any action(s) clearly identified after each recommendation. The summary should follow the model of an ideal Command Language Program as described in DLIFLC Pamphlet 350-9 and cover the following categories.

- (a) Regulatory Guidance
- (b) Linguist Database
- (c) Resources

- (d) Instructional Methodology
- (e) CLP Council
- (f) Marketing
- (g) Training Opportunities
- (h) Incentives
- (i) Evaluation of Programs

(5) Reports on each of these categories should be detailed enough to provide a clear description of the unit's CLP and preclude the need to provide further amplifying data.

b. The Chief of External Evaluation will initiate each report, signed by the author and addressed to the Commandant through the Chief of Evaluation and the Dean of PERT, in turn. A copy of the report will be sent to the unit visited, the Assistant Commandant, Chief of Staff, and the Provost, with information copies provided to the members of the visiting team.

c. A copy of each report will also be sent to elements within DLIFLC responsible for acting on recommendations made during the FAV. A cover letter will be attached to the report describing actions to be taken and established suspense dates. ATFL-ESE will track time lines required of DLIFLC offices that must respond. Follow-up suspenses are set at 30-day intervals.

9. UNIT OBJECTIVES: To accomplish the language maintenance or enhancement goal, units are encouraged to:

- a. provide a high degree of command and installation-level support for the CLP;
- b. specify detailed instructional objectives for the program (and the ongoing, valid measurement of the accomplishment of these objectives);
- c. develop and deliver a high quality instructional program, explicitly based on the established learning objectives;
- d. fully support the program in both concept and resources

At ATTACHMENTS 1 through 3 are a number of questions to provide you with a useful framework for internally reviewing and discussing aspects of your own current or planned CLP. Use these to identify areas in which further information-sharing or other types of assistance by or through DLIFLC might be appropriate and productive.

The Director, Operations, Plans and Programs is the proponent agency for this pamphlet. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements, on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms), or equivalent, to: Commandant, Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center, ATTN: ATFL-ES, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006

FOR THE COMMANDANT:

OFFICIAL:
WILLIAM H. OLDENBURG, II
Col, USAF
Chief of Staff

SUSAN L. KESSLER
CPT, USA
Adjutant

DISTRIBUTION:
C1

ATTACHMENT 1 - Command Support
ATTACHMENT 2 - Recommended Instructional Objectives
ATTACHMENT 3 - Instructional Program Quality
APPENDICES A through E - DoD and service-specific regulations and guidance.
APPENDIX F - General Proficiency Test Availability for DFLP Language January 1994.
APPENDIX G - Recommended Tests/Testing Procedures for Language Evaluation 1 January 1994.

ATTACHMENT 1

COMMAND SUPPORT

One of the most salient characteristics of a successful CLP is the degree and breadth of support provided to the program at the command level and, by example, through the rest of the chain-of-command. The following questions address both command-level issues and the day-to-day aspects of operational support of an effective CLP.

1. Command-Level Considerations

- a. Is the commander accountable for linguist proficiency?
- b. Does the commander's job description contain specific functions and responsibilities regarding the CLP?
- c. Does the commander receive regularly scheduled briefings and other reports on the CLP?
- d. When problems arise in the CLP, is the commander receptive to the issues and willing to provide needed support?
- e. Are there identifiable gaps within the chain-of-command that affect the nature or level of CLP support?
- f. Do the commander and others in the chain-of-command have an accurate picture of the language mission requirements of the personnel under their control?
- g. Is the commander aware of potential sources of assistance and support to the CLP through his or her reporting chain, to include requesting support from DLIFLC or other Department of Defense (DoD) agencies?

2. Language Council

- a. Does the unit have a standing CLP council?
- b. Does the council include at least the following unit members (or their representatives): Personnel Officer, Operations Officer, Logistician, Resource Manager, Command Language Program Manager(s) (CLPMs), and Commanders?
- c. Does the council consist of all unit members who have an interest in the CLP?
- d. Is council membership recognized and documented as an official duty for all members?
- e. Has the council been formally established via an appropriate unit charter or a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)?
- f. Is the chairperson selected by the council based on the criteria of DFLP knowledge and experience vs. position and rank?
- g. Does the council meet regularly (quarterly or more often)?
- h. Does the council follow by-laws or other procedural guidelines?
- i. Does the council prepare and follow an agenda?

j. Does the council prepare and distribute meeting minutes?

k. Do council recommendations become policy (following command endorsement)?

l. Do the rationale and SOP for the council provide for an promote both command-level and chain-of-command involvement in CLP planning and operation?

3. Command Language Program Manager (CLPM)

a. Does the unit have an identified and filled Command Language Program Manager position?

b. Is the CLPM position full-time and authorized on the personnel or manning tables at the unit level commanded by an O-6?

c. Has consideration been given to using a full-time civilian CLPM with specified job description?

d. Does the CLPM have some academic background or experience in foreign language education or related areas?

e. Is the CLPM position at a level of authority within the organizational structure that is compatible with the language requirements of the unit's mission?

f. Does the CLPM take part in command quarterly or annual training briefs?

g. Is the CLPM the chairperson of the CLP council?

h. Is the CLPM's continuous tenure assured for at least a year, preferably longer?

i. Have all substantive functions of the CLPM been adequately documented through job descriptions, SOPs, or other means?

4. Linguist Record-Keeping and Tracking

a. Does the CLPM maintain a database with at least the following elements for each linguist in the unit:

(1) Basic demographic data, including duty assignment and primary occupational specialty or job title; additional language training completed following DLIFLC graduation; ongoing language training; Estimated Termination of Service (ETS) and Permanent Change of Station (PCS) dates; Foreign Language Proficiency Pay (FLPP) status;

(2) Administration dates and results of all Defense Language Proficiency Tests (DLPTs) taken, including the version of the DLPT (DLPT III, IV, etc.);

(3) Required retesting dates for FLPP; and

(4) Individual training plans (ITPs) including language maintenance or improvement objectives driven by the requirements of the personnel or manning authorizations?

b. Do entries in the database match individual linguists' personnel records on file at the servicing military personnel office? Are procedures in place to insure that the data remains current and accurate?

c. Is a historical database maintained as a point of reference for measuring changes in overall linguist proficiency from year to year and for assessing the effectiveness of the CLP?

5. Linguist Retention and Incentives

a. Is a linguist incentives and awards program in place that carries promotion points or other tangible benefits, for example, Linguist of the Year or Quarter?

b. What percentage of the unit's linguists are eligible for FLPP?

c. Has the unit established a specified target percentage of linguists who will qualify for FLPP?

d. Are linguists routinely alerted and counseled on Linguist Life Cycle opportunities, such as the Summer Language Program (SLANG); Military Language Instructor Program; Middle Enlisted Career Advancement Program (MECCAP) for Signal Intelligence (SIGINT); Defense Advanced and Area Studies Program (DALASP) for Human Intelligence (HUMINT); Intermediate and Advanced DLIFLC courses?

e. Does the CLP offer unique opportunities such as Signal Operational Training (SOT) or Live Environment Training?

6. Standing Operating Procedure (SOP)

a. Is a detailed SOP in place covering all aspects and standards for the unit CLP?

b. Does this SOP meet the following criteria?

(1) Is it self-explanatory?

(2) Is it specific in task assignments?

(3) Does it explain the rationale for the program, as well as outline procedures?

(4) Does it specify points-of-contact for issues not specifically addressed?

c. Is it updated on a regular basis to reflect changes in mission, personnel, procedures?

d. Is it an integral component of the unit or command SOP?

7. Adequate Funding

a. Are CLP budget needs adequately identified and documented on a routine basis?

b. Are CLP funding requirements explicitly addressed in annual unit budget planning?

c. Are the CLPM or other CLP council members knowledgeable about procedures to obtain needed CLP funding?

d. Is the CLP involved with and adequately represented in long-range unit budget planning?

e. Are CLP funding requirements separate from other training budgets?

8. Access to Current Regulations:

a. Are the appropriate regulations and information pamphlets readily available? (DoD and service-specific regulations and guidance provided in appendices to this pamphlet as follows: Appendix A, Department of Defense; Appendix B, Army; Appendix C, Air Force; Appendix D, Navy; and Appendix E, Marine Corps.)

b. Is it clear as to where additional or updated regulations can be obtained?

c. Does the installation regularly receive the DLIFLC Distance Education Newsletter? If not, contact the Dean, Proponency and Programs Division (OPP) at the following address: Commandant, DLIFLC, ATTN: ATFL-OPP-DE, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006. The telephone numbers are DSN 878-5112/5319 and Commercial (408) 647-5112/5319.

9. Utilization and Sustainment of Unit Linguist Assets

a. Does the CLP SOP make provision for the use, as instructors, of any qualified military linguist (level 2 or higher) that may be available within the unit?

b. Can linguist assets not assigned to the unit (for example, from other companies or battalions) be used as instructors or assistants in the unit?

c. Is there a development program for linguists in the unit?

d. Does the commander require all linguists to participate in the program?

e. Are the unit linguists allowed and encouraged to provide input to curriculum development or teaching done by others in the unit program?

10. Dedicated Instructional Time

a. Is language training time designated regularly on the unit training schedule?

b. Does the CLPM actively participate in preparation of the training schedule?

c. Does scheduled language training take priority over competing unscheduled training?

d. Is every linguist assured the opportunity to attend a specified amount of language training at specified intervals with specified training objectives?

e. Is the amount of dedicated time on task sufficient for measurable proficiency improvement?

11. Designated Space and Other Training Program Resources

a. Does the unit have adequate, dedicated space for the language training activities?

b. If the current language training facility is not adequate, are there specific plans to upgrade it?

c. Is the training facility conducive to learning (quiet, well-lit, comfortable, kept at proper temperature, open to linguists beyond regular training or duty hours)?

d. Are foreign language texts, supplementary materials, newspapers, magazines, and other resources available in the training facility which are current and appropriate to the program?

e. Is it clear as to where training materials can be obtained?

f. Are the furniture and equipment adequate for classroom instruction and self-study?

g. Does the language training facility have space and equipment for individual listening, reviewing, and studying?

12. Use of Options

a. Is there a program of in-unit refresher maintenance-platform foreign language instruction?

b. Are self-study materials available to linguists for use at their convenience? If so, what kind of materials?

c. Is the use of self-study materials encouraged?

d. Can linguists check out self-study materials to use during off-duty hours?

e. If local adult education courses in the target language are available in the local area, does the CLPM subscribe to and receive the course bulletins? Does the CLPM enroll linguists in appropriate courses during the duty day or encourage off-duty enrollment?

f. Does the CLPM regularly afford linguists opportunities for operational readiness training as part of the CLP, i.e. Forward Area Training (FAT), Live Environment Training (LET), and Cryptological Training and Evaluation Program (CTEP)?

g. Does the CLPM receive training bulletins or journals listing other CONUS or OCONUS language instructional opportunities, such as college or university and commercial programs? If not, contact the appropriate Service Program Manager (SPM) for information. See the applicable service appendix for the SPM's address and phone number.

h. Do the linguists make use of these training opportunities?

i. Does the CLPM make use of any job-specific foreign language training and evaluation programs, such as Voice Interceptor Comprehensive Evaluation (VICE) Interrogator Comprehensive Evaluation (ICE), or Technical Support Package (TSP)?

j. SIGINT only: Does the unit have a TROJAN system? Are linguists regularly scheduled to work in it?

k. Are the linguists regularly enrolled in regional resident military training programs, such as the I Corps Language Program at Ft. Lewis or the Foreign Language Training Center Europe (FLTCE)?

l. Does the CLPM regularly request enrollment in the DLIFLC intermediate and advanced courses for the linguists?

m. Does the CLPM know what refresher or enhancement courses are available? (Contact the appropriate SPM for details.)

13 Use of DLIFLC Services

a. Has the CLPM identified which of the unit's requirements might be met by DLIFLC assistance with the following?

(1) Advice and guidance on establishing and maintaining a language program

(2) Curriculum selection or development

(3) Availability of DLIFLC instructional material

(4) Teacher training workshop

(5) "Train the trainer" workshop for CLPMs and platform instructors

(6) Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) Proficiency Standards Familiarization Workshop

(7) Language Program Managers planning workshop

(8) On-site language training through Mobile Training Teams

(9) Course-specific testing and CLP evaluation

(10) Clarification, DLPT administration and interpretation issues

(11) Telephonic or face-to-face speaking proficiency interviews

(12) Information on current DLIFLC developments in training and testing materials, educational technology, and class scheduling and enrollment policies, including intermediate and advanced courses.

b. For additional information on available DLIFLC services, contact the Director, Office of Plans and Programs at the following address: Commandant, DLIFLC, ATTN: ATFL-OPP, Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944-5006. The telephone numbers are DSN 878-5114/5130/5319 and Commercial (408) 647-5114/5130/5319.

ATTACHMENT 2

RECOMMENDED INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

1. The first step in designing an instructional program, or evaluating the quality and effectiveness of an existing program, is to have a detailed set of operational specifications for the intended linguistic performance outcomes of the instruction. Once these instructional objectives have been clearly specified in explicit terms of what the student should be able to do with the language as a direct result of the instruction, it becomes possible to

a. plan and implement the instruction so as to maximize the likelihood that the students will attain these objectives (and determine the amount of time required to meet these objectives),

b. implement the instruction in a straightforward, efficient manner, and

c. develop (or obtain) and administer end-of-training evaluation instruments that will accurately indicate the extent to which the instructional objectives of the training have been met.

2. The exact nature of the instructional objectives, as well as of the instruction itself, will be critically influenced by the answer to the following questions.

a. Is the intent of the instruction to develop (or refresh) the participating linguists' general language proficiency, as operationally defined by the ILR skill level descriptions?

OR

b. Is the intent of the instruction to teach a limited, specialized subset of the language for particular, highly discreet, job-related purpose?

3. In the former case, appropriate end-of-training evaluation tools are available in the Defense Foreign Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) batteries, which include paper-and-pencil tests of listening and reading comprehension, as well as a tape- and booklet-based test of speaking ability. Test results on the DLPT are reported in terms of the established ILR levels (e.g., 1+, 2, 2+) for each skill, and provide a "common yardstick" of general language proficiency across the Services and DoD agencies. DLPT batteries, developed and validated by DLIFLC, are available for administration through Test Control Office (TCO) channels worldwide.

4. In the latter case, it is necessary to develop or otherwise obtain specialized tests which zero in on the particular elements of language that constitute the instructional objectives of the program. DLIFLC

can assist in this effort by working with unit personnel to develop the necessary instruments or by playing a coordinating and quality-control role with outside contractors charged with test preparation or curriculum development on behalf of the CLP.

5. The following checklist is divided into two sections depending on whether the instructional goal is general proficiency development or specialized training on job-related elements.

a. General Proficiency Goal

(1) Does the command use the most current DLPT for the relevant languages?

(2) Does the unit have a designated and properly trained Test Control Officer who administers the DLPT?

(3) Is the testing facility adequate to insure high-quality test administration (quiet location, working tape recorders, individual headsets with individual volume control for the listening comprehension test, good lighting, proper room temperature, etc?)

(4) Are DLPTs regularly administered to all linguists on completion of the proficiency development or maintenance training courses?

(5) Does every linguist in the unit have an up-to-date and correct record (e.g., DA Form 330), showing the student's most recent DLPT results?

(6) Have provisions been made for and are speaking proficiency tests routinely accomplished, using the DLPT tape- and booklet-based speaking test?

(7) Since DLPT results are reported only up to Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) Level 3, has provision been made for the telephonic testing of linguists who require demonstrated proficiency above Level 3 to meet mission requirements?

(8) Is a local database of DLPT results, including numerical converted scores as well as ILR level scores, maintained?

(9) Does this database contain DLPT scores on every linguist from arrival in the unit to departure?

(10) Is a mechanism in place to interpret and use these results in the ongoing evaluation of the CLP?

(11) For more information, see Appendix F, General Proficiency Test Availability for DFLP Languages.

b. Job-Related Elements Goal

(1) Has the unit (or a training contractor working on the unit's behalf) developed and promulgated a detailed set of instructional course objectives for the CLP, in which the intended linguistic performance outcomes are clearly and operationally defined?

(2) Have achievement testing instruments, directly based on and embodying the instructional objectives, been developed, either locally or through an outside contractor?

(3) Have the developed achievement testing instruments been reviewed by an objective external agency (DLIFLC or other qualified organization) with respect to their technical measurement characteristics, as well as their linguistic content?

(4) Are these achievement tests routinely administered on completion of the instructional program?

(5) Do students, instructors, and others involved in the language course receive feedback obtained from the achievement tests?

(6) Does the CLPM regularly use the results of the end-of-training testing to track and document deficiencies or improvements in the training program over time?

6. Ongoing (Course-of-Training) Testing: It is important, in both general proficiency-oriented and job-related training programs, to be able to determine student progress at frequent points during the program of instruction, not simply on completion of training. The following considerations are relevant.

a. Are mechanisms in place to test student progress periodically during the course?

b. For proficiency-oriented courses: Are the progress tests themselves proficiency oriented, in the sense that they require the student to carry out the same general types of real-life tasks that will be at issue in the end-of-course proficiency assessment?

c. For job-related courses: Do the progress tests comprise a subset of those particular performance elements (to be tested again in the end-of-course assessment) which are relevant at that particular point in the course? (Note: operationally and linguistically "parallel" forms of the final test questions should be used for the interim testing, not the exact items appearing in the final test.)

d. Are the results provided to the student and instructors as quickly as possible following test administration, so as to permit adequate attention and remediation over the balance of the course?

ATTACHMENT 3

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM QUALITY

The nature of the instructional program, as well as of the criteria properly used to evaluate it, depend to a large extent on the programs' instructional objectives. As discussed in the preceding section, there are essentially two broad categories of objectives, maintenance (or further development) of the linguists' general language proficiency, and teaching a limited subset of the language for particular job-related purposes. Guideline questions below relating specifically to one or the other of these goals are preceded by the phrase "General Proficiency" or "job-Related" as appropriate. Questions not specifically categorized are considered relevant to both general proficiency and job-related learning situations.

a. Curriculum

- (1) (General Proficiency) Does the curriculum provide specifically for teaching language skills as defined in the ILR guidelines?
- (2) (General Proficiency) Is the program of instruction based on the entering proficiency levels of the linguists (e.g., advanced linguists do not have to return to a "basic" level of instruction, but are given enhancement learning tasks that build upon their current level?)
- (3) (General Proficiency) Are current, appropriate, and authentic audio or video materials used for structured tasks which strengthen learners' proficiency?
- (4) (General Proficiency) Are linguists provided opportunities to use the foreign language in real-life situations outside of the classroom?
- (5) (Job-Related) Is the curriculum based on a detailed analysis and specification of the job-specific language tasks the linguists will be expected to perform?
- (6) (Job-Related) Do the instructional materials and teaching context attempt to replicate, to the greatest extent possible, the specific linguistic environment encountered in the operational setting (with respect to acoustic conditions, use of specialized terminology or expressions, speed of delivery, etc.)?
- (7) (Job-Related) Do field exercises incorporate language use?
- (8) Is the curriculum regularly revised to incorporate lessons learned from previous offerings of the instruction?

(9) Are diagnostic and remedial procedures established to assist students with their peculiar learning problems?

(10) Is learner progress monitored through regular performance testing and feedback?

(11) Are self-study materials available (e.g., computer-assisted instruction, individual learner packets) to perform or support the instructional process?

b. Instructors

(1) Does the CLP have a detailed instructor job description, including performance standards?

(2) Do program instructors have the following qualifications:

(a) (General Proficiency) At least ILR level 3 proficiency in the target language?

(b) (Job-Related) Direct and detailed knowledge of the operational language-use requirements at issue in the linguists' field assignments?

(c) A sufficient level of English to communicate adequately with English-speaking students?

(d) Demonstrated successful foreign language teaching experience or formal education in foreign language teaching?

(3) Does the CLP provide pre- and in-service training for the instructors?

(4) Do instructors work with the CLPM in planning the curriculum, sequence and scheduling of instruction, and developing of individual training plans (ITPs)?

(5) Does the CLP provide instructors sufficient administrative support, including ready access to the chain of command?

(6) Are supervisory channels for instructors clear?

(7) If the CLP has contract instructors, who monitors contract compliance?

(8) Do instructors receive periodic performance reviews or contract compliance feedback?

(9) Does a positive rapport exist between instructors and students? Between instructors and chain of command?

c. Time on Task

(1) Does all time spent in language instruction demonstrably support curricular goals already established?

(2) How is the amount of time (daily, weekly, monthly) spent on language training determined?

(3) Is the amount of time provided for student contact with the language, including formal classroom training, scheduled self-study, or any other program contact time, based on a realistic analysis and estimate of the time needed to obtain specific language objectives?

(4) Are linguists receiving scheduled time on task for language training? How much?

(5) Is time on task documented and reported to the commander?

(6) Is a mechanism in place to effectively protect time on task from interference? (Is time on task effectively assured from interruption?)

d. Provision for Continuity

(1) Are all CLP SOPs and other records self-explanatory for a CLPM successor?

(2) Does the CLPM have a specific orientation program for a CLPM successor?

(3) Are contingency provisions specified in the unit CLP SOP to allow for continuity in the event of:

(a) Unforeseen changes in mission requirements;

(b) Loss of the CLPM;

(c) Budget cuts;

(d) Disestablishment of language council;

(e) Functional reorganization; or

(f) Loss of established training options?

APPENDIX A

Department of Defense Regulations and Guidance Relevant to Command
Language Programs

DoD Dir 5160.41, Defense Foreign Language Program

DoD Dir 5210.70, DoD Cryptologic Training

DoD Dir 3305.2, General Intelligence Training

DoD 1322.8-C3, Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support
(DANTES) Catalog for Education and Learning Centers

DLIFLC Pam 350-5, Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center
Catalog of Instructional Materials

DLIFLC Pam 350-8, General Catalog of the Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center

DLIFLC Pam 350-9, The Defense Foreign Language Training Program

DLIFLC Pam 350-12, Apr 88, DLPT III Familiarization Guide

DLIFLC Pam 350-13, Non-Resident Training Services and Materials

Defense Intelligence College Catalog

Defense Intelligence Agency Training Course Catalog

National Cryptologic School Course Catalog (For SIGINT linguists only)

NSA/CSS Circulars-Cryptologic Training System: 40-1, 40-2, 40-3, 40-
11, 60-38 (For SIGINT linguists only)

APPENDIX B

U.S. Army Regulations and Guidance Relevant to Command Language Programs

The SPM AO address and telephone number:

Army Language Program Manager
HQDA (DAMI-PII-T)
Room 2C475, The Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20310

DSN: 225-4211/2120 COMMERCIAL: (202) 695-4211/2120

DA Pam 611-16, Handbook of Army Personnel Tests

DA Circular 350-85-2, Language Training for Enlisted Personnel

AR 1-1, Planning, Programming and Budgeting within the Department of the Army

AR 108-2, Army Training and Audiovisual Support

AR 140-1, Mission, Organization, and Training

AR 220-1, Unit Status Reporting (with appropriate MACOM supplements)

AR 335-15, Management Information Control System

AR 350-1, Army Training

AR 350-3, Tactical Intelligence Readiness Training (with appropriate MACOM supplements)

AR 350-12, Cryptologic and Signal Intelligence Training

AR 350-20, Management of the Defense Language Program

AR 350-20, Appendix E, Mobile Training Teams

AR 351-1, Individual Military Education and Training

AR 351-9, Interservice Training, 1 Jul 86

AR 600-200, Enlisted Personnel Management System

AR 611-5, Army Personnel Selection and Classification Testing

AR 611-6, Army Linguist Management

AR 611-101, Commissioned Officer Specialty Classification System

AR 611-112, Manual of Warrant Officer Military Occupational Specialties

AR 611-201, Enlisted Career Management Fields and Military Occupational Specialties

AR 621-1, Training of Military Personnel at Civilian Institutions

AR 621-5, Army Continuing Education System (ACES)

FLPP Guidance (Message dtd Apr 88, to be incorporated in AR 611-6)

FORSCOM 140-11, Military Intelligence Special Training (MISTE Program)

FORSCOM 350-22, FORSCOM Command Language Program

FORSCOM 350-22, Annex 4 to Appendix D, Reserve Components Goals and Standards

FORSCOM/ARNG 350-2, Reserve Component Training

INSCOM 350-3, INSCOM Command Language Program

INSCOM Project Babel

REDTRAIN Handbook (INSCOM)

Unit SOP (at battalion-or-brigade-level)

USAREUR Regulation 621-1, Education. The Foreign Language Instruction Program

USAREUR Regulation 350-1, USAREUR Training Directive

USAREUR Regulation 351-2, Schools. HQ USAREUR/FA Proponent Responsibilities for Seventh Army Combined Arms Training Center Courses of Instruction

USAREUR Regulation 621-5, Education. Army Continuing Education System (ACES)

APPENDIX C

U.S. Air Force Regulations and Guidance Relevant to Command Language Programs

The SPM AO address and telephone number:

Chief, Education Branch
Directorate of Force Management
Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, USAF/INFP
Washington D.C. 20330-5110

DSN: 224-6131/6133 COMMERCIAL: (202) 694-6131/6133

AFR 35-13, Foreign Language Proficiency Pay, 6 Nov 87

AFR 39-11, Airman Assignments, Jul 89

AFR 50-40, Management of the Defense Foreign Language Program

AFR 50-18, Interservice Training, 1 Jul 86

AFR 50-23, On-the-Job Training, 21 May 84

APPENDIX D

U.S. Navy Regulations and Guidance Relevant to Command Language Programs

The SPM AO address and telephone number:

Navy Foreign Language Program Manager
Chief Naval Operations
Navy Department, OP-132C12
Washington, D.C. 20350-2000

DSN: 224-6851 COMMERCIAL: (202) 694-2851

OPNAVINST 1500.27__, Interservice Training

OPNAVINST 1550.7__, Management of the Defense Foreign Language Program

OPNAVINST 7220.1__, Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

OPNAVNOTE 7220, Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

NAVSECGRUINST 1550.6__, Cryptological Training Enrichment Program

APPENDIX E

U.S. Marine Corps Regulations and Guidance Relevant to Command
Language Programs

The SPM AO address and telephone number:

Cryptologic Manpower/Training Officer (INTS)
Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps
Washington, D.C. 23080-0001

DSN: 224-1208/1449 COMMERCIAL: (202) 694-1208/1449

MCO 1200.7__, MOS Manual

MCO 1510.50, Individual Training Standards

MCO 1550.__, Marine Corps Foreign Language Program (exact order number
pending final approval)

MCO 1550.4__, Management of the Defense Foreign Language Program

MCO 1580.7__, Interservice Training

MCO 7220.52, Foreign Language Proficiency Pay

MCO 11540.33__, Cryptologic Training

MCO P1000.6__, Assignment, Classification, Testing and Standards
(ACTS) Manual

NSGINST 1550.6, Cryptologic Training Enrichment Program

APPENDIX F

General Proficiency Test Availability for DFLP Languages January 1994

The listing below shows, for each DFLP language and skill modality (listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and speaking), the testing instruments or procedures suggested by DLIFLC for use in Foreign Language Proficiency Pay (FLPP) determination or for other testing purposes in which a general proficiency assessment based on Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) proficiency level standards is required.

DEFENSE LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS

The Defense Language Proficiency Tests (DLPT) are the preferred testing instruments for any language/skill modality in which they are available. The table beginning on page F-3 shows the most recent version of the DLPT (DLPT I, DLPT II, DLPT III, DLPT IV, or in some instances, the reading-only DLRPT) available for a given language/modality. For any given language, earlier DLPT versions than those shown in the table should not be used; the most recent version should always be administered.

Arrangements for DLPT administration should be made through the closest or most convenient Test Control Office handling these tests.

OTHER TESTING AVAILABLE AT OR THROUGH DLIFLC

For language/skill modalities for which a DLPT is not available, there are, in a number of instances, alternative testing capabilities. These include: direct (face-to-face) interview testing at DLIFLC; telephonic testing using DLIFLC examiners; direct interview testing at other government agencies; and telephonic testing using examiners from other government agencies. All of these alternative procedures are coordinated by:

Commandant
Defense Language Institute
Foreign Language Center
Evaluation Division, Test Management (ATTN: ESE-TM)
Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944

Tel: DSN: 878-5228
COMMERCIAL: 408-647-5228

For testing conducted at DLIFLC, the following services are available:

Listening: direct interview
Speaking: direct interview

Reading: direct interview, involving comprehension questions based on printed texts.

For testing conducted telephonically with DLIFLC examiners, the following services are available:

Listening: telephonic interview
Speaking: telephonic interview
Reading: (not available)

For testing conducted at other government agencies (coordinated through DLIFLC), the following services are available:

Listening: direct interview

(NOTE: Some agencies do not report separate interview-based listening scores. For purposes of score annotation, the overall speaking score may be considered representative of the listening level also.)

Speaking: direct interview
Reading: direct interview, involving comprehensive questions based on printed texts.

For testing conducted telephonically by examiners at other government agencies, the following services are available.

Listening: telephonic interview

(NOTE: Some agencies do not report separate interview-based listening scores. For purposes of score annotation, the overall speaking score may be considered representative of the listening level also.)

Speaking: telephonic interview
Reading: (not available)

For proficiency evaluation in language/skill modalities other than those listed, the DLIFLC Evaluation Division, Test Management section, may in some instances be able to offer additional information and advice.

The listing on pages F-3 to F-6 will be periodically updated to reflect the introduction of new DLPTs and/or changes in the availability of other testing procedures.

APPENDIX G

Recommended Tests/Testing Procedures for Language Evaluation
1 October 1993

Below are the recommended tests/testing procedures for evaluating general proficiency in the three skill modalities of listening comprehension, reading, and speaking for the listed DFLP languages. Abbreviations shown in the "Test/Testing Procedure" columns should be interpreted as follows:

DLPT I, II, III, IV: Defense Language Proficiency Test, versions I through IV.
 DLRPT: Defense Language Reading Proficiency Test.
 DLI: Face-to-face or telephonic test conducted at DLIFLC.
 OA: Face-to-face or telephonic test conducted at another government agency, coordinated through DLIFLC.

For information on "DLPT" and "DLRPT" testing, contact the local Test Control Office (TCO).

For information on "DLI" and "OA" testing, contact:

Commandant
 Defense Language Institute
 Foreign Language Center
 Evaluation Division, Test Management (ATTN: ESE-TM)
 Presidio of Monterey, CA 93944

Tel.: DSN 878-5228
 Commercial 408-647-5228

For languages not listed, contact DLIFLC Evaluation Division, Test Management, at the address above.

TEST/TESTING PROCEDURE

CODE LANGUAGE	LISTENING	READING	SPEAKING
AA Afrikaans	OA	OA	OA
AB Albanian	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
AC Amharic	OA	DLRPT	OA
AD Arabic/Modern Standard	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
AE Arabic/Egyptian	DLI	---	DLI

Arabic/Iraqi (See DG)

AM	Arabic/Maghrebi	OA	---	OA
AN	Arabic/Saudi	OA	---	OA
AP	Arabic-Syrian	DLI	---	DLI
BN	Bengali	OA	OA	OA
BU	Bulgarian	DLPT I	DLPT I	DLPT I
BY	Burmese	DLPT II	DLPT II	OA
CA	Cambodian	DLPT II	DLPT II	OA
	Cebuano	OA	OA	OA
Chinese-Amoy (See YD)				
CC	Chinese/Cantonese (includes Yueh)	DLPT II	DLPT II	OA
CM	Chinese/Mandarin (Classical Characters)	DLPT II	DLPT II	OA
CM	Chinese/Mandarin (Simplified Characters)	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
CX	Czech	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
DA	Danish	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
DG	Arabic/Iraqi	DLI	---	DLI
DU	Dutch	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLI
ES	Estonian	OA	OA	OA
FJ	Finnish	OA	OA	OA
FR	French	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
GM	German	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
GR	Greek (Modern)	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLI
HS	Hausa	OA	DLRPT	OA
HC	Haitian-Creole (Includes French-Creole and Martinique-Creole)	OA	DLRPT	OA
HE	Hebrew (Modern)	DLPT I	DLPT I	DLI

HJ	Hindi	OA	DLRPT	OA
HU	Hungarian	DLPT I	DLPT I	DLI
JA	Japanese	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
JC	Icelandic	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
	Ilocano	OA	OA	OA
JN	Indonesian	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLI
JT	Italian	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
KP	Korean	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
LC	Laotian	DLPT II	DLPT II	OA
LE	Latvian	OA	OA	OA
LJ	Lingala (Includes Ngala)	OA	OA	OA
LT	Lithuanian	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
MG	Malagasy	OA	OA	OA
ML	Malay	See JN	See JN	OA
MV	Mongolian	OA	OA	OA
NE	Nepalese	OA	OA	OA
NR	Norwegian	DLPT I	DLPT I	DLI
PA	Papiamento	OA	OA	OA
PF	Persian (Includes Farsi)	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
PG	Persian-Afghan	OA	OA	OA
PL	Polish	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
PQ	Portuguese- Brazilian	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLPT II
PT	Portuguese- European	DLPT III	DLPT III	DLPT III
PV	Pushtu-Afghan	OA	OA	OA
QB	Spanish	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV

(Includes LA & SR)

RQ	Romanian (Includes Moldavian)	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
RU	Russian	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
SC	Serbo-Croatian	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLPT II
SJ	Singhalese (Includes Maldivian)	OA	OA	OA
SK	Slovak	OA	OA	DLI
SL	Slovenian	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
SM	Somali	OA	OA	OA
SW	Swahili	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
SY	Swedish	DLPT II	DLPT II	OA
TA	Tagalog	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
TC	Tamil	OA	OA	OA
TH	Thai	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLI
TU	Turkish	DLPT IV	DLPT IV	DLPT IV
UK	Ukranian	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA
UR	Urdu	OA	OA	OA
VN	Vietnamese-Hanoi (Also Annamese)	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLI
VS	Vietnamese-Saigon	DLPT II	DLPT II	DLI
YD	Chinese-Amoy	DLPT II	DLPT II	OA
YJ	Yiddish	DLPT I	DLPT I	OA