

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**



NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE

Minutes of December 2017 Commission Meeting

The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (the Commission) held a meeting on December 14-15, 2017. The meeting concerned organizational and other pre-decisional and deliberative matters and was closed to the public pursuant to Public Law 114-328, section 554(b)(3). The Commissioners agreed to make a separate version of these minutes available to the public.

Attendance

Commissioners present:

- Mr. Edward T. Allard III
- Mr. Steve Barney
- The Honorable Mark Gearan
- Ms. Avril Haines
- The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck
- Ms. Jeanette James
- Mr. Alan Khazei
- Mr. Thomas Kilgannon
- Ms. Shawn Skelly
- The Honorable Debra Wada

Commissioners absent:

- The Honorable Janine Davidson

Others present:

- Kent Abernathy, Executive Director
- Jill Rough, Director of Research and Analysis
- Keri Lowry, Director of Governmental and Public Engagement
- Gregory Brinsfield, Director of Operations (present except for portion of 12/15 meeting)
- Paul Lekas, General Counsel
- Rachel Rikleen, Deputy General Counsel (present for portions)

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

- Yolanda Hands, Operations Program Manager (present except for portion of 12/15 meeting)
- Peter Morgan, Deputy Director of Operations (present except for portion of 12/15 meeting)
- LTC Marc Austin, OUSD(P&R), Office of Manpower & Reserve Affairs (present for portion of 12/14 meeting)
- Sandy Scott, Corporation for National and Community Service (present for portion of 12/15)

December 14, 2017 Session

At approximately 0900, Commissioners gathered at the Commission's offices to sign non-disclosure agreements relating to a classified briefing scheduled for the morning.

Commissioners and staff then traveled to an offsite location in Crystal City for a series of briefings provided by representatives from the Department of Defense (DoD).

Upon arrival at the offsite location, the Chairman moved to make the meeting closed to the public because classified information would be briefed and pre-decisional and organizational matters would be deliberated. All Commissioners present agreed.

Briefing by Joint Staff Directorate for Intelligence

Beginning at approximately 0925, Commissioners received a classified threat briefing from CAPT Andrew J. Charles, Deputy to the Deputy Director for Analysis & Warning (DJ22) in the Joint Staff Directorate for Intelligence (J2). The briefing, titled "Threat Assessment: 2022+" occurred at a secure location in Crystal City. Notes and slides from the meeting are maintained in a secure container. CAPT Charles provided the following unclassified summary of his briefing:

- Threats from state and non-state actors will continue to exist, but the face of that threat will evolve
- Protracted, large-scale war that would benefit from conscript skill sets is not anticipated; the threat will be more technologically savvy and careful not to cross Great Power redlines
- Mass communications and social media present a challenge to governance and national security, especially to a DoD postured to "win the nations wars"
- "Emerging" countries have the advantage of selecting the easiest U.S. vulnerability to exploit for their specific gain
- Technology evolution outpaces current Defense (and likely government-wide) acquisition processes

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Briefing by Army Marketing Research Group (AMRG)

Beginning at approximately 1110, Commissioners received a briefing from the Army Marketing Research Group (AMRG), titled “Increasing Propensity for Military Service through Marketing.” COL Johnny Oliver, Deputy Director of AMRG, led the briefing. Also in attendance were CSM Luther Legg, Senior Enlisted Advisor; John Jessup, Director of Research; LTC Margaret Nowicki, Special Assistant; and Andrea Zucker, Deputy Director of Research.

Ahead of the presentation, AMRG distributed the slide deck included in Addendum A. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from AMRG’s presentation.

AMRG began by discussing the four main challenges faced by Army recruiting: the civilian-military divide; misperceptions about military service; the fact that fewer Americans meet military service qualifications than in the past; and changing career values.

Civilian military divide. (Slide 4.) Americans are not well informed about the military or the Army, in part due to more limited exposure to the military. In addition, AMRG has found that nearly half of the adult population reports that the entertainment industry has a significant impact on the way they perceive veterans. These and other factors have led to misperceptions about the Army. While 72% of Americans have “high confidence” in the military, only 13% of 16-21 year olds say they are likely to join the military (this figure is 8% for the Army). AMRG noted that 72% is high but not nearly as high as it was in the past.

Misperceptions about military service. (Slide 5.) AMRG explained the results of a survey conducted by a non-governmental research organization in 2014. According to AMRG, the study indicated that the majority of respondents had misperceptions about a number of facts, including the likelihood that veterans will suffer from mental health issues, commit suicide, and abuse substances when compared to the general population. To AMRG, this means that there is more work to do to correct misperceptions. Note: AMRG did not know how the term “veteran” was defined in the referenced study.

Youth Market Data / Qualifications to Serve. (Slide 6.) Data generated by Joint Advertising, Market Research, & Studies (JAMRS) shows that there are not enough “high quality” youth propensed to serve, where high quality youth are those that have strong academic credentials, are within the 17-24 year old population, and are eligible. This means that the DoD must reach a larger pool of youth prospects since it is competing with colleges, vocational schools, and private industry for the same population of highly qualified youth that are also propensed to serve.

Career Values. (Slide 7.) The slide contains data generated by JAMRS demonstrating the most and least important values for youth – not only propensed youth – when making choices about jobs and the organizations they want to work for. Most important values included making a good living; doing great things with your life; good work-life balance; and something to be proud of. Least important values include serving as a protector of your country; being part of an

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

elite organization; training in technology; and working as part of a team. JAMRS publishes this sort of data three times per year, according to AMRG.

AMRG then addressed ways in which marketing can increase the propensity to serve.

AMRG began this portion of the discussion by briefing the Commission on the “consumer decision journey.” (Slide 8.) Whereas the Army viewed the journey as more of a funnel in the past, now it is a loop: Awareness → Engagement → Activation → Access. Those who access help to increase awareness in new individuals, and so on; AMRG calls this the “loyalty loop.”

Current Army marketing efforts are guided by an overall enterprise brand strategy. The current campaign (see slide 9) is “Army First!” This is a change from the Army’s previous focus on individual benefits and personal transformation (think: “Army of One”) to putting the Army as an institution, at the forefront of all communication. The change was made in the third quarter of 2015. The reason was a belief that people will not want to be part of an institution if they do not understand it, and so they wanted people to focus on valuing the Army as an institution and valuing service in that institution. Commissioner’s noted that this approach seemed to be at odds with the information in slide 7, which suggested that people’s values about an institution or organization do not strongly motivate people to make career decisions.

The brand strategy also has an enterprise positioning statement – something like a mission statement. (Slide 10.) AMRG created this statement following a survey of 22,000 people in which people were asked to talk about their ideal Army.

The Army does market to some specific capabilities and competencies, for example medical/dental, chaplain, and legal. (Slide 11.)

The Army has also recently been moving more towards digital advertising. The current integrated strategy favors digital over non-digital media at a 7:3 ratio.

AMRG then played two commercials for Commissioners. The first commercial was designed to address a misperception about the Army, and focused on technology, diversity and inclusiveness, and high education. They noted that diversity has been an issue and that the Army recently has had less success in minority communications because of race relations concerns across the nation. The second was for Cyber Command. This commercial, which won a Clio Award, included a hidden puzzle. Over two million people visited the website with the hidden puzzle; 723,000 attempted the puzzle, 323 solved it, and of those, 94 interviewed for a position with Cyber Command. Notably, AMRG did not indicate the number of actual hires resulting from this effort. AMRG viewed the commercial as successful in reaching the people the Army needs to recruit for specialized jobs.

AMRG tracks (slide 13) brand health and awareness from third party market research companies such as Nielsen and Milward Brown Kantar; those firms also provide data on prospect and influencer attitudes. They also use data from JAMRS to evaluate effectiveness of marketing campaign and data on propensity. Campaign components target both prospects – youth 18-24 years old – and influencers (parents, counselors, coaches, etc). JAMRS provides propensity data.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Millward Brown provide data on prospect and influencer attitudes. The Army coordinates its research with other military departments but not with other government agencies such as CNCS or the Peace Corps.

Commissioners asked how a massive call to service would help Army recruiting. AMRG said that it would help -- rising tides would likely help the Army as they would help other destinations. This turned into a discussion about barriers faced by the Army in attracting qualified candidates. Foreshadowing comments the Commission would hear in later briefings, AMRG noted that the obesity epidemic restricts the available pool, as does academics (under DoD policy, the Army can bring on only about 40% of individuals with lower test scores, even though Army recruiting has less difficulty attracting that population). AMRG also noted the increased number of young people with criminal charges as further limiting the available population.

Commissioners asked if the Army recruits for MOS. AMRG said the Army does not recruit for MOS, each of which has its own requirements – and some of those requirements may exceed what is applied to recruits more generally.

Mr. Kilgannon asked about the importance of a high school curriculum that teaches military history, service, and related topics. AMRG noted that there is no effort other than JROTC. But, he noted further, JROTC is a citizenship class – not a recruiting program – and that it is against the law to recruit people who are under 17 years old.

Mr. Barney asked at what point do young people become propensed to serve. AMRG emphasized the importance of influencers—teachers, parents, counselors—and instilling a service ethic at a younger age.

Briefing on Reserve Mobilization

Beginning at 1300, CDR Teague “Swami” Swalm briefed the Commission on reserve mobilization. CDR Swalm is the Deputy Director of Mobilization within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, which is part of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

Ahead of the presentation, CDR Swalm distributed the slide deck included in Addendum A. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from CDR Swalm’s presentation.

CDR Swalm represents “reserve integration,” which has responsibility for oversight of statutes and policy for the reserve component (RC) of the military services. The key DoD policy governing the RC is DoD Instruction 1235.12, “Accessing the Reserve Component.” For each military service, the RC represents several distinct groups of individuals, including ready reserves, standby reserves, and retired reserves. The ready reserves include selected reserves and inactive reserves. The selected reserves include those drilling once a month and two weeks per year along with other categories, such as the National Guard. Slide 5 provides detail on the numbers of individuals in each category for each military service.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Reserves are mobilized based on category. Mobilization would proceed by category from left to right on slide 5, with the last group mobilized being retired reserves. As CDR Swalm explained, certain procedures and authorizations are required to mobilize different categories of reserves; for example, a retiree recall order is required before mobilization of a retired reservist.

CDR Swalm further explained that declaration of a National Emergency activates a number of statutory authorities necessary for mobilization. The National Emergency for the Global War On Terror (GWOT) has been renewed each year. Renewal activates, among other things, 10 USC 12302, which facilitates access to the reserve component and permits involuntary activation of reservists. (He explained that 10 USC 12302 is the primary basis for reservist mobilization.) Currently, there are approximately 40,000 involuntary activations each year. Absent renewal of a National Emergency, CDR Swalm says statutory changes would be required to mobilize reservists.

Today's military relies on the availability of reserves as a given. This is in contrast to certain times in the past where the reservist pool was more of a luxury. Dr. Rough described this development in similar terms, explaining that reserves used to be strategic and are now considered operational.

The timeline for getting people from the station and into the theater would be set out by the Presidential order directing mobilization; no existing authority provides the time, although there are some rules that are waivable. It falls to each military service to develop its own readiness plan for each type of reservist.

Briefing on Army Accession Program

Beginning at approximately 1410, the Commission received a briefing on Army recruitment, assessment, and selection processes from Paul Aswell, Chief of the Accessions Division in the Army's Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, G1.

Ahead of the presentation, Mr. Aswell distributed the slide deck included in Addendum A. He requested that the Commission not make the slides public. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from Mr. Aswell's presentation.

Mr. Aswell began by providing the Commission with background on the all-volunteer Army. He explained that during Vietnam, selective service was perceived as being an injustice. He described the anti-war movement as really an anti-draft movement. Historically, conscription, when used, was used to supplement the volunteer force and that only in two years did the United States draft more people than volunteered to serve.

Mr. Aswell next addressed how the military determines its needs. That is based partly on deployment and the force levels required by the combatant commands (CCMDs). To determine those levels, CCMDs first design and review a "fiscally unconstrained force," or ideal force requirements, then assess various risks and consider executability, supportability, and affordability to generate a "fiscally constrained force." (Slide 5.) Using the Army as an example, once these strategic and operational requirements are established, there are processes to

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

develop appropriate capabilities, determine authorizations, acquire material, and so forth that, together, lead to the development of combat-ready units. (Slide 6.)

Mr. Aswell then turned to accession. The Army recruits officers for specific skills and seeks to maintain end-strength only in the needed specialties. There is no expectation that soldiers, whether enlisted or officer, will fill out their entire careers in the Army. Mr. Aswell provided a number of statistics indicating a significant level of natural attrition. For example, only one in three active officers reach a 20-year retirement; only one of 150 reaches the general officer rank; and 70% of new enlisted soldiers do not go beyond their initial term. Mr. Aswell indicated that the average enlistment period is 48 months, though longer for specialists; for example, language specialists' average enlistment period is seven years. Average Army training for enlisted soldiers is 26 weeks, though longer for specialists. (Slides 7-9.)

Mr. Aswell next turned to qualifications for enlistment. These are set out on slide 10. Mr. Aswell noted that most kids do not qualify for enlistment in the Army.

Because there is no draft, recruiting is an important part of the Army. Currently, the Army makes 17 to 21 million contacts in order to generate 95,000 accessions. (Slide 12.) The Army recruits a gender mix, similar to the mix among enlisted soldiers. If the Army recruits more than are needed, the additional recruits go into the delayed entry pool. The Army has about 12,000 recruits in the pool, but needs more. Currently, everyone the USAF recruits is in the pool because they have been so successful in their recruiting efforts. The Army's geographical accessions footprint is illustrated in slide 13.

There are a number of reasons why someone may be disqualified from enlisting in the army. (Slide 14.) The main reasons are ineligibility due to a medical condition, criminal history, or dependency (too many or single parent), which disqualifies 41.6% of the eligible population of 17-24 year olds; lack of education or poor test scores, which disqualifies 20.2%; and being overweight, which disqualifies 14.8%. Together, this yields an eligible or "qualified" pool representing 23.4% of the 17-24 year old population.

The enlistment process includes several screening processes. Among these is testing. Each potential enlistee must complete the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB). This tests math abilities, facility with mechanical objects, English language skills, and other elements. There is another test known as the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT). The ASVAB and AFQT are essentially the same test organized in different ways. Both are adaptive tests. Testing began back in 1917, and the ASVAB has been used in its current form since the 1970s. By law, up to 20% of the enlistee population may score as low as tier IV (similar to 10-30th percentile); by policy, the Army allows only 4% of the enlistee population to score at that level. Additional testing looks at physical assessment (slide 24) and personality (slide 25).

Mr. Aswell next addressed how the Army analyzes the market for potential recruits. The Army engaged in demographic, production, socio-political, and economic analyses. (Slide 19.) Mr. Aswell noted that high unemployment areas and areas near military bases are often strong recruiting locations.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Mr. Aswell then discussed recruiting methods. (Slides 20-22.) Traditional methods include telephone and face-to-face meetings at schools, community events, and so on. Social media has become an increasing significant part of recruiting. The Army also generates leads through referrals, canvassing, and events such as state fairs and sporting events, and through advertising. The Army targets its message not only to prospects but also influencers. Influencers are defined as adults in the 35-54 year old age group who are primary influencers for the 17-24 year old target youth. The Army emphasizes outreach to parents as key influencers.

Mr. Aswell addressed ways that the Army might expand its market of potential enlistees. One approach would be to issue more enlistment waivers. (Slide 23.) Waivers may be necessary due to changes in society; for example, an increase in prime-market arrests, increased rates of drug use; increase rates of diagnosis for conditions such as asthma, ADHD, and anxiety disorders; and improved medical procedures with respect to eye conditions and other physical and mental conditions.

Mr. Aswell then discussed a series of slides illustrating the geographical distribution of enlisted soldiers and commissioned soldiers in the Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve. (Slides 28-33.) Over the past decade, in each group there has been a geographical move south and east. The Army has data on these demographic changes.

Mr. Aswell then discussed the process of executing on a draft. (Slide 34.) He noted that draftees would require basic training, which on average lasts 25 weeks, along with 30 days of leave per year. He noted that DoD does not support the draft but does believe selective service registration has benefits – noting that the Selective Service System (SSS) maintains records of 85 million men in the ages 18-80. He further noted that no draft could occur without a bill passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. With the authorization for mass mobilization, the SSS is activated. The SSS would activate 56 state headquarters at designated National Guard armories along with 436 area offices staffed with 500 reservists, 1,500 recalled retirees, and 700 state volunteers. Then 2,069 local boards staffed with 11,000 volunteers would be established, a lottery would be conducted, and individuals would receive orders to register at a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS).

MEPS are where applicants for military service go to complete the enlistment process. The MEPS are DoD facilities paid for by the Army, which also serves as the Executive Agent. There are 65 MEPS locations: 19 on military installations, 15 in federal buildings, and 32 in commercial buildings. The current MEPS capacity is 300,000 per year. Were the SSS activated, MEPS would require capacity for an additional 10,000 per month. Mr. Aswell said this could be done and there is a way to increase capacity.

Individuals report to MEPS for an examination. (Slide 35.) Only two of ten individuals who report to MEPS are qualified. Those qualified are then inducted. They then go to training. In the event of a draft, DoD would need to develop plans about where each inductee goes for training. Mr. Aswell noted that there are studies showing that with existing infrastructure and some expansion, it would only take weeks to get people from induction to training.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Mr. Aswell concluded by reviewing recommendations for the all-volunteer Army. (Slide 38.) Those include: determining who makes the best soldiers and recruiting and retaining those kind of recruits; establishing high recruiter standards to minimize misconduct and abuse; carefully targeting incentives to the most hard-to-fill specialties and continually update the targets; recruiting noncitizens with a path to citizenship; marketing to both recruits and influencers; and offering competitive pay.

Commissioners asked Mr. Aswell to elaborate on trends. Mr. Aswell noted that health concerns are principal among these, including an increasingly large portion of the available population that is considered overweight. He explained that any health problem will be exacerbated by military service. Mr. Aswell referenced data maintained by JAMRS, which the Commission requested. Vice Chair Wada noted a recent Center for Disease Control study in which one of five people surveyed experienced health issues.

Commissioners asked whether conscription would allay some of the costs associated with recruitment. Mr. Aswell believes from a cost perspective, it would be a wash due to increased training costs associated with readying conscripted forces.

The session ended at approximately 1545. Commissioners and staff returned to the Commission's offices for further discussions.

Launch Event Deliberation

At approximately 1600, the Commission held a discussion about the upcoming Commission rollout event, scheduled for January 18, 2018. Mr. Abernathy began by outlining the objectives of the event. Mr. Brinsfield updated Commissioners on potential venues. Ms. Lowry outlined the preliminary structure for the event. Commissioners and staff then discussed potential panelists and speakers. Names raised in the discussion included: Sebastian Junger; Colin Powell; William McCraven; Condoleeza Rice; Madeline Albright; Chelsea Clinton; Barbara Bush; Lindsey Graham; and Bob Gates. Mr. Khazei indicated that Stanley McChrystal was unavailable for the launch but very much supported the Commission's work and may be available for a future event. Commissioners and staff also discussed potential moderators for the panel discussion at the launch event. As summarized by Chairman Heck, the launch event would include a media event, opening remarks by Commissioners and members of Congress; a panel event with VIPs; and a possible speaker. Chairman Heck also tasked Dr. Rough and Ms. Lowry with developing a detailed plan for the launch event along with subsequent outreach and research events for the Commission to hold in the first half of 2018.

The December 14, 2017 session concluded at approximately 1705.

December 15, 2017 Session

The Commission resumed its meeting at approximately 0800 on December 15, 2017. All Commissioners except for Dr. Davidson were present. Staff present included Mr. Abernathy, Mr. Brinsfield, Dr. Rough, Ms. Lowry, and Mr. Lekas. Ms. Rikleem and Mr. Scott joined the meeting during the presentation by Peace Corps.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Reflections on Service: Lt Col Becky Lange

Lt Col Becky Lange (USAF) is an alum of the AmeriCorps program. She was inspired to join AmeriCorps following the State of the Union Address in 1995, during which President Clinton discussed AmeriCorps and the then-new initiative now known as CNCS.

Lt Col Lange joined AmeriCorps and served in the second class of NCC. She was stationed at Lowry AFB in South Dakota and provided security for the Olympic Games in Atlanta, among other projects. She then attended the University of Colorado. She later served as a Fellow for Senator Bill Nelson, and in her military career, worked for a time for Chairman Dempsey on the Joint Staff.

Lt Col Lange remains on active duty. She is a squadron commander in cyber intelligence at Fort Meade, with 240 people in her squadron. She describes her squadron as 90% Millennial.

Lt Col Lange shared her thoughts on service with the Commission. She noted that while many have gone from the military to AmeriCorps, few have gone from AmeriCorps to the military.

Commissioners asked for her views about a universal call for service. Lt Col Lange, stated that based on her experience working closely with Millennials, they do not like to be issued specific things to do. Rather, a message to Millennials might be along the lines of “get involved, but get involved in your own way. Figure out what matters to you, and find a way to do something about it.”

Commissioners asked how important monetary incentives were in Lt Col Lange’s decision to join AmeriCorps. She said they were absolutely important. She had to pay for college, and had to find out how to do it. She had always volunteered growing up and had a mother who did random acts of kindness. But she does not know if she could have afforded to serve without the financial support provided by the program.

Briefing by Service Year Alliance

The Commission received a briefing by Shirley Sagawa regarding Service Year Alliance (SYA). Ms. Sagawa serves as President and CEO of SYA. Ahead of the presentation, Ms. Sagawa distributed the slide deck included in Addendum A. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from Ms. Sagawa’s presentation.

SYA began about two years ago. Stanley McChrystal is the Chairman of SYA, and Commissioner Alan Khazei is Vice Chair.

SYA’s vision is to make a year of service common among young Americans, and its short-term goal is to grow service opportunities for young Americans to 100,000 per year. Currently, about 65,000 people serve in AmeriCorps, PeaceCorps, and the privately-funded organizations under SYA’s umbrella. (SYA has a data sharing arrangement with CNCS but no formal relationship.)

SYA’s view is that a service year generates a “triple bottom line.” First, a service year changes the lives of the young people who provide service. Second, a service year solves problems. Ms.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Sagawa noted that this means more than just seeming helpful; it requires addressing problems at scale using evidence-based strategies. Third, a service year develops a diverse group of leaders.

Ms. Sagawa then talked about how to create a service year. Creating a service year requires three elements: a young person, a program to host the person, and funding to pay the person a living allowance. Currently each service year participant receives about \$1,000 per month. Funding comes from the government and private sector. Government funding includes AmeriCorps and YouthBuild grants. Government funding is also used for government-run programs, such as Peace Corps, VISTA, NCCC, and FEMA Corps. There is also indirect federal funding through student loan forgiveness, non-competitive eligibility for federal jobs, and so forth. A number of private sector employers have agreed to give preference to those who have served. (See partial listing on slide 10.)

Ms. Sagawa noted SYA's view that Millennials—those in the 21-36 year range—want to participate in a service year. Polling from about two years ago indicates that 80% expressed support for doing a service year. Many, however, are not aware that opportunities exist or can be created for them to serve; according to a recent poll, only about 25% had awareness.

SYA is now focusing more on what it calls “Generation Z” as most Millennials have aged out of the service year program target range of 18-24 years old. Ms. Sagawa described Generation Z as different from the Millennial generation – specifically, she described Millennials as more idealistic, and Generation Z as more practical.

SYA is available to assist service organizations in four ways. First, through national recruitment campaigns. The goal of these is to unify recruitment. Examples include digital ads directed at young people; partnerships with companies, such as LinkedIn; and pursuing higher education issues such as seeking credit for a service year. (The latter effort has been unsuccessful thus far.) Second, SYA provides a technology platform that assists in directing young people to projects that meet specific criteria. Third, SYA has policy and advocacy operations. Fourth, SYA has a growth team that helps to develop new programs. Ms. Sagawa noted that the existing field lacks absorption and new programs are required to enable additional young people to serve. She mentioned elder care as an area with particular need.

Commissioners asked about research collected or maintained by SYA, and in particular the reasons why people may choose not to serve. Ms. Sagawa said that SYA maintains member profiles, which include members' answers to the question, “Why do I want to serve?” On this question, the responses cover a full spectrum of reasons. SYA has not done a study on the reasons why people do not serve. She noted that most people serve on a voluntary basis (with the exception of ex-offenders in the Youth Build program).

Commissioners asked for data on people who do or do not complete their service year. SYA does not maintain this sort of data, but Ms. Sagawa said CNCS does, and that AmeriCorps targets a 90% retention rate.

SYA does not apply criteria for people serving although certain government programs do.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

The average age of those who complete a service year is at the higher end of the 18-24 age bracket, although the target age is 18.

SYA applies the criteria used by AmeriCorps with respect to prohibited activities. She noted, though, that where a service year is funded by an organization outside of the government, there is room for expansion of the definition of “service” and the opportunities available – particularly for religious-based service.

Commissioners asked Ms. Sagawa about facets of an ideal system from SYA’s perspective. She said it is important to create expectations early on, to teach kids as early as K-8 about the value of service, while acknowledging the difficulty with this given limitations on the federal government’s ability to guide the content of education. Then, during the high school years, it is important to explore and plan for opportunities that young people can undertake when in the 18-24 year old range. Following service, there are a number of benefits.

Commissioners asked if Ms. Sagawa had a theory about how to create expectations to serve. She talked about local pilots, how community are doing different things, how could they do other things. Expansion at the local level is important.

Commissioners then viewed a video featuring Stanley McChrystal, the SYA Chairman. The video highlighted several themes, including the need to conceptualize citizenship around a common experience in which young people ask themselves “Where will I serve?” rather than “Will I serve?”

Following the video, Commissioners posed additional questions to Ms. Sagawa. They asked if there are divides in the young population, if there are parts of the population that are particularly hard to get. Ms. Sagawa’s view is that everyone is “gettable.”

Commissioners then asked about the costs of doing a service year. Ms. Sagawa explained that health insurance and payroll taxes are the big costs. If there is a way to reduce those costs, potentially by amending higher education law, that would provide a boon to enrolling more young people in service years.

Commissioners asked if there is part of the population that the Commission should target in its outreach. Ms. Sagawa noted the importance of targeting the rural population, but also believes it is important to target urban young people as well.

Commissioners asked if there is a demographic that gravitates to the sort of problems that service years are intended to address. Yes, white, college-educated women. Ms. Sagawa noted that SYA has used advertising to make service seem more masculine.

Briefing by the Peace Corps

The Commission received a briefing on the Peace Corps from Sheila Crowley, Director of the Peace Corps. Ahead of the presentation, Ms. Crowley distributed the slide deck included in

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Addendum A. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from Ms. Crowley’s presentation.

Ms. Crowley began with an overview of the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps since its founding has focused on grassroots efforts in places where a local or host government has invited it. The PeaceCorps works in six sectors: education (about 40% of its work); agriculture; community economic development; health; youth in development; and the environment. Further background on the Peace Corps and its history is at slides 2-7.

Ms. Crowley then turned to recruiting. Since 2010, the Peace Corps has undertaken an effort to modernize its recruiting. In 2010, the Peace Corps received fewer than 10,000 applications, which was an all-time low. Following improved recruiting efforts, described in the next paragraphs, applications since 2014 have been steadily over 20,000 per year. (The Peace Corps has only 4,500 available slots and targets a 5:1 ratio of applicants to selected.)

One change was to introduce “choice” to Peace Corps applicants. Prior to 2014, the Peace Corps directed recruits to the locations that had the most need. From 2014 to the present, the Peace Corps has allowed applicants to choose where they want to volunteer. About 50% of volunteers choose their destinations, while the remainder agree to go wherever need dictates.

In addition, the Peace Corps realized that it had too low representation from multicultural males of the millennial generation. Ms. Crowley played two of the Peace Corps’ new ads for the Commission. Both reflect an effort to attract multicultural, millennial males. The Peace Corps has also focused more generally on diversity, with a goal to reflect the face of America. Now, 36% of applicants, and 32% of onboards, identify as racially or ethnically diverse. In 2010, only 14% of those onboarded identified as racially or ethnically diverse.

Commissioners asked how Peace Corps was able to increase its diversity. Ms. Crowley said there were several reasons. First, the Peace Corps made a policy change to permit first-generation Americans to serve in their family’s place of origin. Second, the Peace Corps improved its communications with influencers – especially parents. Third, they created a program called “Peace Corps Prep” at colleges. This involves creating a core curriculum leading to a certificate; the curriculum includes coursework in foreign languages, foreign affairs, and so forth. Completing the program does not increase the chances of a student being accepted into the Peace Corps but does give students a leg up in areas relevant for their application and work. Over 50 colleges have the Prep program, which started in 2007 and improved around 2014. Fourth, the Peace Corps has created internships for students to serve as campus recruiters. There are about 500 of these; a requirement is to demonstrate multiple connections on campus, which helps to foster diversity in the applicant pool. Fifth, the Peace Corps has targeted historically black colleges and universities and other colleges that demonstrate a focus on diversity.

Ms. Crowley addressed training for Peace Corps volunteers. Training lasts three weeks and includes language, health, cultural awareness, security, and other areas.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

The Peace Corps has also developed a program focused on short-term, high-impact response opportunities. This program began in 1996 as Crisis Corps. The newest version of the program, created four years ago, is called Global Health Service Partnership. There are 150 alumni and 50 currently-serving volunteers. Volunteers make a one-year agreement yet 50% extend their commitment for a second year.

Ms. Crowley discussed benefits to Peace Corps volunteers upon their return to the United States. Benefits include access to a transition adjustment allowance (now around \$8,000); access to grant programs; graduate school benefits; potential connections and employment through the Employers of National Service program (a partnership with CNCS); and loan forgiveness programs for public service work. Ms. Crowley noted that Peace Corps volunteers are also sought after. As an example, in a new partnership with FEMA, FEMA reports that the Peace Corps volunteers are the best prepared of the various groups of people providing services to FEMA. Commissioners asked Ms. Crowley about health care. Health care is covered for volunteers during their service; following service, they may enroll in transition care.

Commissioners asked Ms. Crowley about respect for Peace Corps. She did not know officially but said polling indicates that people have a positive view of the Peace Corps even if they lack awareness. There seems to be a lot of goodwill associated with the name.

Commissioners asked about Peace Corps volunteers wearing uniforms or other indicia of the United States when abroad. They do neither, and there are several reasons why. Volunteers are meant to go into local communities as regular Americans. Everyone knows that they are from the United States and there is no need to wear a logo or flag to make that clear (Ms. Crowley noted that in many places, the volunteers are the only Americans the locals have ever met). Mr. Gearan added that there is a security concern in some places with Peace Corps volunteers dressing like Americans, particularly because they are not in the embassies and some think the volunteers are undercover CIA.

Commissioners asked how the Peace Corps works with the military when the military is engaged in a similar program in the same country. Ms. Crowley explained that the Peace Corps seeks to operate separately from the military and that generally, there is no overlap between missions of the two organizations – typically, when the military and Peace Corps are in the same country, the Peace Corps is engaged in rural areas while the military would be in urban or coastal areas. Peace Corps coordinates its work through its country director who would exchange information for deconflicting purposes with the rest of the U.S. government contingent in a particular country. Ms. Crowley also noted that military efforts (unlike Peace Corps efforts) are typically short term. She noted that there may be times when Peace Corps volunteers help the military to get out a message – for example, during the Ebola crisis, in Sierra Leone and two other countries, Peace Corps country program employees (who are predominantly host country nationals) assisted in training locals and spreading the word about available resources.

Commissioners asked about Peace Corps' interest in expanding. Ms. Crowley explained that growing the Peace Corps would require additional funding. With requisite funding, the Peace

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Corps would want to grow to 10,000 participants – a goal they have been working towards for twenty years now. The Peace Corps is not interested in expanding beyond that figure for various reasons, including the need to work with host countries and concerns about saturation.

Commissioners asked what Peace Corps does with unsuccessful applicants. Ms. Crowley noted that Peace Corps receives about five applicants for every one accepted into the program. Unsuccessful applicants fall into three categories: competitive; not competitive today but potentially competitive with additional experience; and not competitive. The latter group they may refer to AmeriCorps.

Ms. Crowley noted that the Peace Corps is in the process of a study about volunteerism by Peace Corps volunteers following their return to the United States.

Commissioners asked about the process by which the Peace Corps is invited by a host country. Ms. Crowley gave Sri Lanka as an example: the Peace Corps previously had operations there, and is in the process of restarting its program. Sri Lanka has invited back the Peace Corps and one goal of the program will be to help replenish English language skills that have diminished since the Peace Corps departure. Ms. Crowley said the Peace Corps works to establish goals for the program at the beginning of any engagement and works closely with the host country as a partner. They are careful to avoid seeming like the “ugly Americans” and also take care to avoid any suggestion that the Peace Corps is really a front for intelligence.

Reflections on Service: Julia Bouchelle

Ms. Bouchelle served in Peace Corps for three years in Panama. The first two years she served as a Peace Corps volunteer, and she remained for a third year to serve as a volunteer leader.

She identified several factors that led her to service. She attended a Jesuit college where service was a core value. She also had experience representing the country as a soccer player and wanted to represent the country in a different way. And she had a long-standing interest in giving back to others.

Ms. Bouchelle also explained what attracted her to the Peace Corps. First, it would be a challenge and she could learn about herself. Second, there were professional benefits, including being part of the Peace Corps network, and relief from graduate school student loans. Third, it would present a leadership opportunity. Ultimately it was the leadership opportunity that led Ms. Bouchelle to remain in Panama for a third year. Fourth, it was an opportunity to work abroad, which distinguished Peace Corps from AmeriCorps (which Ms. Bouchelle also considered). Fifth, unlike AmeriCorps, Peace Corps was a two-year commitment, which is something Ms. Bouchelle was looking for.

City Year and Voices for National Service

AnnMaura Connolly, who serves as the Chief Strategy Officer and Executive Vice President of City Year as well as the President of Voices for National Service (VNS), introduced a City Year

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

volunteer, Chris Doyle, to provide the Commission with reflections on his service. Following Mr. Doyle's presentation, she provided briefings on City Year and VNS.

Reflections on Service: Chris Doyle

Chris Doyle is a CityYear volunteer, currently in his second year with City Year. Last year, he served in Wisconsin and this year he is serving in Washington, DC, in the Southeast in Ward 8. Mr. Doyle is 25 years old.

Mr. Doyle began by telling Commissioners a story of a current student of his, Andre. Mr. Doyle's attention to Andre made a meaningful impact on Andre's ability to improve his schoolwork and self-esteem.

Mr. Doyle pursued service to follow in footsteps of his family. He said he always wanted to be a teacher, as were his mother and grandfather. He had been interested in teaching and worked in education since graduating from college. He was led to City Year for a few reasons. A mentor suggested he consider City Year, and it would give him an opportunity to move away from home. At the same time, it would allow him to work with students in education though he felt he was not ready for the responsibility that would come with being a primary teacher (for example, in Teach for America). Incentives were also a factor. He said that after 1700 hours of service, he would qualify for education awards that would enable matching or discounted tuition at universities with which City Year has partnerships.

Briefing on City Year

Ms. Connolly then briefed the Commission on City Year. Ahead of the presentation, Ms. Connolly distributed the slide deck included in Addendum A. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from Ms. Connolly's presentation.

City Year was founded 30 years ago by Mr. Khazei and others. AmeriCorps helped to expand City Year across the country, particularly given the CNCS resource focus on education (about 50%). Currently, there are over 3,000 City Year members in 28 cities at 313 high-need schools. City Year defines a "high need school" as one with a graduation rate less than 50%. City Year is also in three cities in the United Kingdom and in Johannesburg, South Africa. There are now approximately 30,000 City Year alumni. This network has helped to create a pipeline for City Year participants to move into education jobs following their City Year experience. (Slide 2)

Ms. Connolly explained that there is a real demand for City Year slots, and in selecting among candidates, the staff looks for real diversity, a real mix of folks. Approximately 56% of City Year AmeriCorps members are people of color, 48% are Pell Grant eligible, 51% indicate interest in a teaching career, and 80% are college graduates. Those chosen serve a full school year and work full time, living on a stipend. The City Year "special sauce," as Ms. Connolly described it, is the near-peer connection: in other words, the teachers are not so dissimilar in terms of age from the students they are teaching. In this way, they help to show students the future. Ms. Connolly noted that City Year teachers make positive calls to home which is

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

something new for many of the students being taught and goes hand-in-hand with the optimistic, can-do spirit and energy that City Year attempts to foster.

City Year has adopted a “whole school whole child” model. (Slide 5.) Ms. Connolly summarized the model as “ABC,” standing for attendance, behavior, and coursework. City Year members provide extra boots on the ground to help lead teachers achieve these goals. Ms. Connolly reviewed results of the City Year program based on recent studies conducted on the City Year program. (Slides 8-10.) With respect to “ABC,” one study found that among 6th-9th grade students served, City Year helped to drive a 46% reduction in the number of students off-track in math, a 57% reduction in the number of students off-track in English language arts, 36% of students with a 90%+ attendance rate, and 68% of students moving on-track in social-emotional skills.

City Year teachers receive one month of training before beginning their work. Their training continues throughout their City Year service.

Commissioners asked about City Year programs for rural schools. Ms. Connolly said that City Year remains focused on urban areas but has assisted other organizations in developing programs targeted towards rural areas.

Commissioners asked about the process that leads to a City Year invitation. Ms. Connolly said that it could begin in various ways – the school district might invite City Year, or it could be someone in philanthropy or business, for example. In any case, City Year will evaluate an invitation according to certain criteria. A school must meet the requirements and the City Year board must approve expansion. Ms. Connolly noted that City Year has never closed a single site.

Ms. Connolly then addressed funding. (Slide 12.) She explained that funding for City Year is highly leveraged: each source—AmeriCorps plus state, local, and school district funding—is matched 2:1 with private sector contributions. She also noted that City Year is able to scale its program in part because of a special dispensation that permits City Year not to pay City Year AmeriCorps members a minimum wage.

Commissioners asked about the main reasons why people apply to City Year. Ms. Connolly said there are two main motivations. One, they see it as a pathway into education. Two, they are uncertain of what they want to do and need to pay off loans. In either case, people tend to want to be part of something bigger. The main impediment, according to Ms. Connolly, is parents, who do not see working for City Year as a real job.

Ms. Connolly closed by noting that City Year since its beginnings has always been bipartisan and has always had an interest in advancing policy objectives.

Briefing on Voices for National Service

Ms. Connolly next briefed the Commission on Voices for National Service (VNS), for which she serves as President. Ahead of the presentation, Ms. Connolly distributed the slide deck included

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

in Addendum A. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from Ms. Connolly's presentation.

VNS is a steering committee for 27 different service organizations, including City Year. VNS engages in a number of activities, including focus groups and polling; development of national service policy; engaging with the Hill.

Ms. Connolly discussed VNS' efforts on the Hill, where they have a regular presence. She mentioned Senator Blount as a huge advocate. She also highlighted the National Service Caucus, which is co-chaired by Sens. Thad Cochran (MS) and Chris Coons (DE) in the Senate, and Reps. Doris Matsui (CA) and David Price (NC) in the House. Ms. Connolly noted a proposal by the White House in 2017 to eliminate funding for CNCS. Congress rejected this proposal and funding for CNCS will remain level for the current fiscal year. She said VNS is working to educate the current administration about CNCS and sees the Commission as an opportunity to do so.

VNS also conducts polling and focus groups on national service. VNS has worked with a third party, TargetPoint, on recent polling and focus groups. An October 2015 poll of voters showed 83% support for Congress maintaining or increasing federal investment in national service. (By party, 78% of Republicans, 90% of Democrats, and 84% of Independents supported.) Voters also believed that national service (*note*: it was not clear how "national service" was defined in this poll) "restores values of patriotism & civic duty" (76%); "prepares young people for the workforce" (80%); "builds stronger neighborhoods and communities" (79%); and "helps replace government handouts and empowers more people to be self-sufficient" (74%). Ms. Connolly noted that in this round of polling, they did not ask for people's views on a mandatory service requirement.

VNS, through Michael Myers at TargetPoint, is conducting focus groups in Virginia and Missouri. The most recent one occurred last week. One question posed to the group was about a mandatory service requirement. Most participants said "no" but did say service should be done on a volunteer basis and were "intrigued" about how it could be done. Ms. Connolly said she would share the report with the Commission when received from the polling company. Ms. Connolly said that in their research, on these sorts of questions, there is, notably, virtually no difference between people in Virginia when compared to people in Missouri, although in Virginia there appears to be more knowledge of the AmeriCorps and SeniorCorps programs. People seem aligned in the view that the federal government should invest more in national service. Also, videos of people serving really resonate with people in different places. Ms. Connolly said she would share the focus group report when they receive it from TargetPoint.

Ms. Connolly left the Commissioner with four ideas for discussion:

- Share information about both military and civilian service opportunities at the time of registration for selective service

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

- Build a pipeline/connective tissue between civilian and military service so that those who are not eligible for military service learn about civilian service opportunities
- Launch a campaign to ask every American to either serve in the military or civilian national service (new version of “Uncle Sam Wants You”) and engage private sector partners to help promote the campaign
- Capitalize on the national service movement’s ability to scale civilian service opportunities

Ms. Connolly noted one issue that requires a legislative fix, and that involves grants to City Year and other participants that go directly to schools. Schools are taxed on these funds, which leaves less available for the programs.

Ms. Connolly also discussed the Employers of National Service initiative. This effort, developed by CNCS, VNS, and others, currently has about 500 employers enrolled. The objective is to improve access to employment opportunities for those who have served.

Vice Chair Gearan asked Ms. Connolly about the biggest, most transformative idea she sees today. Ms. Connolly said it would be to frame the movement as a broad expansion of military and national service – a continuum – with something for everybody. This would help to build demand. She believes we are not currently showing that continuum to people who may be propensed to serve. She referenced the “Uncle Sam” idea and connecting the dots across all types of service in order to penetrate the younger generation.

Briefing on Partnership for Public Service

Max Stier, President of the Partnership for Public Service (PPS), briefed the Commission on PPS and its goal to improve the federal government. Mr. Khazei, Mr. Brinsfield, and the Operations team were not present for this presentation.

At the start of his presentation, he noted that PPS sponsors the Service to America Awards – known as the “Sammys” – which are intended to honor federal employees and, in the process, improve communication with the federal government work force.

Mr. Stier next provided the Commission with an overview of what’s “broken” in the federal government on the civilian side.

First, demographics. Only six percent of federal civilian employees are under 30 years of age. In the information technology space, there are five-times more employees over 60 years old than are under 30 years old. The demographic concerns regarding age is now becoming an issue as technology develops and the federal workforce gets older. Based on these data, Mr. Stier does not see demography as being a forcing agent to change the federal work force.

Second, morale. Results of regular surveys indicate that morale is generally low – there is a 16-point spread between government and the private sector. He attributes this to problems with government leaders and systems.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Third, structural changes. The federal government pay system was designed in 1949. At that time, there was a lot of clerical work in the federal government, compared with today when there is more emphasis and need for professional work. The pay system has not kept up with changes in the employment needs and landscape.

Fourth, leadership. Mr. Stier sees this as the most fundamental issue. There are 4,000 political employees. No other democracy has anything like this. 200 of 600 top positions are now nominated and confirmed. Short-term leaders often do not have interest aligned with the long-term interest of the organizations they lead. Political and non-career employees have no accountability, and are not held to performance reviews. But Mr. Stier believes there is a dearth of leadership also among civilian and career employees. He believes leadership must be held accountable for the talent pipeline.

Mr. Stier believes there is opportunity for improvement.

Internships are one area that could be improved. Mr. Stier stated that the federal government does not have internship programs, which are then drawn from for full time employment. (Ms. Haines pointed out that she was aware of several internship programs that do just that in government, including State/L, but of course the key point that there are not enough may still be valid.) Mr. Stier described the problem as more cultural than structural, a problem that harkens back to the leadership deficit in the federal civilian workforce. Mr. Stier explained that the federal government misjudges talent and stacks the deck against new talent. Internship programs are too few, are not part of strategic planning, and too often are family & friends programs rather than programs focused on merit.

Looking beyond internship programs, Mr. Stier explained that everything that should happen is happening somewhere in the federal government. The intelligence community probably is the healthiest in terms of how it deals with and cultivates talent. The military, too. Other agencies and departments he has examined, in contrast, views talent more as a cost than an asset that the government can invest in and grow.

Mr. Gearan asked about the pipeline for college students who want to do public service. Mr. Stier recognizes that there are college students who want to engage in public service and want to make a difference. The federal government is not recruiting these folks (Ms. Haines pointed out that she was aware of a number of departments that target college students for recruitment, including the CIA). Consulting firms do sell themselves in this manner. The federal government does not take advantage of the talent available to it and needs to become a better consumer of talent.

Mr. Stier also explained that there is an opportunity for universities to think differently about federal government service. The Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) provides an option for creating incentives for faculty to go into government. Mr. Stier believes IPA programs, particularly if organized and done at scale, would be powerful. Mr. Stier lamented the lack of real long-term strategic planning at the government; this is something that universities could do. Likewise, loan forgiveness programs—such as the one at Harvard Law School—are a good way

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

to encourage students to pursue government opportunities. Mr. Stier believes that universities must over invest in programs to facilitate government service in order to have any pay off.

Mr. Stier noted that government employees average 17 years in government (it was not clear whether he was looking across the US government or only at some subset). This further limits the ability to bring in young, new talent. He noted that the intelligence community (IC) is better than the rest of the government in this respect. He also highlighted recent initiatives, including 18F and the United States Digital Service, which are doing a good job of attracting younger talent.

The Senior Executive Service (SES) also presents problems. 92% of those coming into SES jobs come from within the government, and only 8% of SESs change agencies. These two factors lead to further stagnation. It was not clear whether he was including the Senior Intelligence Service (SIS) in his assessment of the SES.

Mr. Stier mentioned the Government Accountability Office (GAO) as a bright point. The GAO has created a robust career lifecycle that begins with recruiting and survives, and thrives, as employees further their careers with the agency. Commissioners suggested having someone from the GAO brief the Commission.

Commissioners asked what the data show with respect to federal government employee retention. Mr. Stier said the general data indicate strongly that people leave supervisors, not their jobs. This is a problem for the government because in most cases outside of the IC, the only track up is to become a manager, and many people are not good at managing or do not actually want to serve as managers. It was noted that the IC has a separate promotional track that permits people to move up as experts rather than as managers; this approach has not been adopted by the government at large.

Vice Chair Gearan asked for Mr. Stier's view on the effect of a five-year appointment to senior government positions. Mr. Stier expressed a concern that this would politicize the work. He supports positions being merit-based, and said that is a restriction that should persist as other reforms are considered.

Ms. Lowry asked for Mr. Stier's views on the foreign service model. Mr. Stier thinks there is too much automatic promotion in the foreign service model. He believes an easier change would be to hold people responsible – to make managers show that they have succeeded or else put them on probation for a year prior to promotion. He is concerned about further closing access to the external talent pool. He believes there needs to be more mixing of talents in and out of government.

Mr. Stier sees much value in the approach taken by the military with respect to mobility. He favors reforms that would make clear that mobility is not an indication that the employee is a problem. He does, though, have concerns about applying the military up-and-out model wholesale to the civilian context.

Reflections on Service: Andrew Beccara

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Andrew Beccara served as an intern at PPS. He then interned twice at the Department of State before being hired at State for a full-time job. Mr. Beccara, who held five internships in two years before obtaining employment, illustrates some of the difficulties associated with gaining entry to the federal workforce from the outside.

Commissioners asked Mr. Beccara about how to inspire young people to serve in government. Mr. Beccara recommended focusing on a call to service where the impact is unparalleled. There is a lot of opportunity and potential for imitative, on top benefits of which many young people are unaware. In terms of benefits, he mentioned the variety of jobs available, mentoring programs, health care, and stability.

Commissioners asked him about challenges with gaining federal employment. He mentioned the security clearance process; and the difficulty of navigating USAJOBS.

Mr. Beccara noted that many young people are not aware of federal employment. He suggested targeting campaigns at universities, making better use of social media, and generally doing more outreach.

Mr. Beccara's father was in the Marines. Mr. Beccara did not consider military service, though, and decided early in his life that he wanted to pursue different challenges.

Commission Deliberations

The Commission reconvened at 1330 to address various business and administrative matters.

Approval of Minutes

The Chairman led a discussion about the proposed minutes for the Commission's November 2017 meeting. Following this discussion, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the November 2017 minutes as amended.

December 13 Meeting with Congress

Chairman Heck reported on a series of meetings held on December 13, 2017, with members and staff from the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. He informed Commissioners that he, Steve Barney, and Paul Lekas met with Senator Reed, Representatives Thornberry and Smith, and staff from both Committees. He reported that all were comfortable with the Commission's approach to its establishment date and decision that the Commission was established on September 19, 2017. He further reported that both members and staff were very interested in the work of the Commission and pledged their support going forward. Chairman Heck also asked each member to hold January 18, 2018 for the Commission rollout event.

Rollout Event

Mr. Abernathy and Ms. Lowry led a discussion on the January 18, 2018 rollout event. Mr. Abernathy began by providing a six-month outlook. He also introduced Sandy Scott, on detailee from CNCS to provide assistance to the Commission with respect to strategic communications,

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

media strategy, and press relations. Commissioner Heck informed Commissioners that staff had narrowed the options for the rollout event to two: the Hall of the States and the United States Institute for Peace (USIP). Ms. Lowry agreed to follow up with USIP. Ms. Lowry asked that Commissioners provide the following information: headshots; short bios; current location; quotes to use on their behalves; and local media contacts. Commissioners then discussed Sebastian Junger as a possible keynote speaker, and suggested others who could serve in this role and/or on the panel. Ms. Lowry said she would circulate a template email for Commissioners to use when reaching out to potential speakers and panelists. Mr. Brinsfield then briefed the Commission on the status of the Commission website.

Draft Research Plan

Dr. Rough led a discussion on the current draft of the Commission research plan. She divided the plan into four phases, and her discussion focused on the first phase, which would cover at least the first half of 2018. Dr. Rough described the goal to visit urban and rural locations around the United States in a variety of locations and with a diversity of audience types. She pointed out the importance of communicating with the un-propensed population and the private sector, as the Commission would have more ready access to the propensed population.

Ms. Haines suggested the Commission engage in three listening tours: one to gather information, one after issuance of the interim report, and another after issuance of policy recommendations. Dr. Rough noted the similarities of this approach to the one she was developing; it would just add another phase. She also explained that each event will require travel by more than one Commissioner as well as staff to support the event and the Commissioners.

Dr. Rough then turned to the plan for a February event. In lieu of multiple small events, she explained that there would be a single event. The event would be arranged by the January rollout and could be announced at that time.

Mr. Kilgannon made a research request. He questioned the accuracy of the statistic that 1% of Americans serve in the military. He noted that it does not seem to include veterans and feeds the narrative that military is a dead-end job. Chairman Heck agreed and further noted that the statistic does not account for the 80 million Americans who are too young to serve.

Commissioners then endorsed the view that the Commission only use figures that Dr. Rough has validated. They also supported the view that the interim report include information about statistics and other issues that may be subject to misperception.

Operations Update

Mr. Brinsfield briefed Commissioners on the status of operations. He discussed the status of securing information technology resources and then addressed the status of the Commission website. He explained that the Commission is working with the Department of Veterans Affairs to proceed with a rapid contract that will enable development of a preliminary website for the Commission to use for two-to-three months. Chairman Heck then informed Commissioners that

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

the Commission would be using a .gov web address – www.inspire2serve.gov – instead of a .us domain because we cannot use a .us domain and do not want to use a .mil domain.

Mr. Brinsfield then turned to personnel and human resources. He explained that his team had been working to redesign the onboarding process. He noted that Jamie Hammond would join the staff next week as the resource and financial manager; he briefly described her background, including service with the future of the Army commission.

Mr. Brinsfield then updated Commissioners on facility issues, financial management, and travel management.

Legal & Ethics Update

Mr. Lekas began by briefing the commissioners on policies adopted by the Commission, including telework, No Fear Act, ethics, financial disclosure, continuity plans, and website privacy. He noted that the social media policy was under development. He explained that the legal team had conducted detailed analyses of various issues, to include hiring authorities, website regulations, and information collection – each of which would be instrumental in guiding Commission affairs. Mr. Lekas noted that regulations for privacy and freedom of information had been prepared and would be furthered through the regulatory process once official email accounts become available.

Mr. Lekas provided the Commissioners with an overview of the No Fear Act and the Commission’s policy on discrimination, retaliation, and other matters covered by the Act.

Ms. Rikleen then provided Commissioners with ethics training focused on gifts.

Executive Session

At the conclusion of the above, Commissioners convened an executive session outside the presence of staff. The executive session concluded at approximately 1515.

Prepared by Paul Lekas, General Counsel

Adopted by the Commission on January 19, 2018