



NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE

Minutes of July 2019 Commission Meeting

The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (the Commission) held a meeting on June 15-18, 2019, at its offices in Crystal City, VA. The entire meeting concerned pre-decisional and deliberative matters and was closed to the public pursuant to Public Law 114-328, section 554(b)(3). Due to the confidential nature of the deliberation, the Commission is not releasing a separate, public version of the minutes. In addition, these minutes follow a different format than prior minutes due to the nature of the Commission's deliberations. They are intended to record key points of deliberation and decisions made by the Commission. The minutes include three appendices: a resolution passed by the Commission; a list of the proposals originally put before the Commissioners; and the text of proposals as approved during the course of the July meeting.

Attendance

Commissioners present:

- Mr. Edward Allard
- Mr. Steve Barney
- The Honorable Dr. Janine Davidson (by phone as indicated; by proxy at all other times)
- The Honorable Mark Gearan
- The Honorable Avril Haines
- The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck
- Ms. Jeanette James
- Mr. Alan Khazei
- Mr. Thomas Kilgannon
- Ms. Shawn Skelly
- The Honorable Debra Wada

Staff present:

- Paul Lekas, General Counsel
- Jill Rough, Director of Research and Analysis
- Peter Morgan, Director of Operations
- Sandy Scott, incoming Director of Government Affairs and Public Engagement
- Other Commission staff

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

July 15, 2019

Business Meeting

The Commission convened at its offices in Crystal City, VA, at 0800 ET. All Commissioners, except Mr. Allard, were present, with Dr. Davidson joining by phone. Chairman Heck moved to close this and other business meetings to occur during the week of June 15, 2019, because pre-decisional and organizational matters would be deliberated. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote of the Commission.

Chairman Heck moved to approve minutes from the June 2019 Commission meeting. The motion was seconded and minutes were approved by voice vote of the Commission, subject to minor clarifications and technical edits.

Chairman Heck reviewed the agenda for the week. He reminded the Commission that deliberation would commence at 0800 ET each day and continue potentially until 2300 ET each evening. The Commission would break for lunch from 1100 to 1230 ET and for dinner from 1700 to 1830 ET. Each deliberation and voting block would begin, as needed, with a brief review of the proposal, followed by presentation of amendments, deliberation on the amendments and the proposal, and vote on the proposal as amended. With respect to deliberative material provided to Commissions in advance of the July meeting, the Chairman explained that the Commission would vote only on the information designated as “recommendations and implementation” and not on the background information developed by staff on each topic. Adoption of an amendment or proposal would be in accordance with the Commission’s Amended Business Rules, which requires a vote of eight Commissioners in support.

The Chairman explained that the General Counsel will prepare a record of the deliberation and voting in the form of minutes that identify key issues discussed, amendments adopted, and the result of each vote. Information reflected in the record will be on a non-attribution basis. Votes will be recorded as passed or rejected by voice unless any Commission requests a roll call, in which case the vote tally will be provided.

Mr. Kilgannon offered up a resolution to show appreciation for the staff. The text of the resolution is attached. Chairman Heck moved to vote on the resolution, which was seconded. The Commission voted unanimously to adopt the resolution.

Chairman Heck then introduced a brief discussion about the Commission’s moonshot concept. He explained that the recommendations discussed this week would focus on issues of access, aspiration, and awareness and would develop the cradle-to-grave approach to service that Commissioners had discussed in prior sessions. During this discussion, Commissioners stressed that the deliberations include attention on tying specific proposals to the overall moonshot concept and ensuring that the Commission not lose sight of the overarching themes of creating a culture of service, pursuing cross-service initiatives, and addressing the needs of the nation. Chairman Heck noted that the narrative of the Final Report would address these points and that it would nevertheless be helpful to track how the recommendations connect with these goals.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Mr. Allard arrived and joined the Commission meeting at the end of this session.

Lead Service Authority Proposal

At 0820 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on a proposal to create a lead service authority within the Executive Branch. Dr. Jill Rough, Director of Research and Analysis, circulated an options memorandum with several approaches to this proposal, including: (1) to elevate the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) to a cabinet-level agency; (2) to create a council within the Executive Office of the President (EOP) either by Executive Order (EO) or by statute; (3) to create an advisory council of external parties; and (4) to encourage the President to set goals.

The Commissioners identified several characteristics of a lead service authority to include in a reworked proposal. They emphasized that the authority:

- Should be distinct from CNCS, in order to encourage and facilitate cross-service initiatives;
- Should have an independent budget with a congressional appropriation separate from the overarching EOP appropriation;
- Should be headed by a President-appointed, Senate-confirmed official, ideally one with cabinet-rank;
- Should have authority to make decisions independently of the President, or simply act in an advising role;
- Should have a structure that ensures an ability to continue across presidential administrations;
- Should not appear redundant with current agencies or offices;
- Should have an ability to pursue integrated, cross-service interagency initiatives, including with the Department of Defense (DoD);
- Should be supported not only by legislation but by an EO that supports the mission and gives cabinet-rank to the official in charge.

The Commissioners discussed several potential models—such as the Council of Environmental Quality, the Office of Management and Budget, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence—exploring the pros and cons. It was noted that, regardless of where this effort is housed, the effectiveness of the authority will depend on the President’s interest in service programs.

Chairman Heck promised to return to the topic the next day for further debate.

Mandatory Service Proposal

At 0850 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion of the proposal to require mandatory service of every American within a particular age bracket. No amendments were offered for this proposal. During the discussion, Commissioners expressed:

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- An appreciation for the idea of mandatory service and hope this is the direction that the country heads;
- A concern about the practical hurdles that would be faced into trying to implement a mandatory system;
- How messaging this discussion runs the risk of using trigger words, such as “mandatory service,” which will be difficult given the public’s opposition to being told what to do; and
- A concern that the focus on mandatory requirements may undermine the other aspirational goals laid out in the Final Report and keep other recommendations from being adopted.

The discussion reflected a general consensus that the topic of mandatory service is a positive, aspirational goal for the nation that should be addressed in the Final Report, potentially as an approach for the nation, when ready, to consider in the future.

At 0925 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal to recommend mandatory service. The Commission rejected the proposal by voice vote.

Selective Service System (SSS) Proposals

Proposal to Maintain a Draft Contingency

At 0930 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion of the position that the country needs a draft contingency. The key points of the discussion included:

- A concern that abandoning a draft contingency mechanism would send the wrong message to enemies and allies; and
- That supporting a draft mechanism would not imply that the Commission suggests use of the draft for any particular purpose.

Three amendments were offered. The first would add “*to meet the mobilization needs of the Department of Defense during a national emergency*” to the end of the recommendation. The second would include a specific recommendation stating support for the All-Volunteer Force (AVF). The third, which was later withdrawn, would combine the draft contingency proposal with the separate proposal to clarify the purpose and value of a draft. The key points of discussion included:

- The importance of speaking specifically to the necessity of the draft;
- Whether the current AVF exacerbates the civilian-military divide;
- How the AVF stops existing as soon as any conscription takes place; and
- Whether addressing the need for the AVF is within the Commission’s mandate.

At 1000 ET, Chairman Heck called for votes on the amendments. The Commission adopted the amendments by voice vote. Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The Commission then took a ten-minute break.

Proposal to Clarify the Purpose and Value of the SSS

At 1015 ET, the Commission reconvened, and Chairman Heck initiated a discussion of the proposal regarding the value and purpose of a draft contingency mechanism, as reflected today in the SSS and the Military Selective Service Act (MSSA). The key points of the discussion included:

- Recognition that a future draft may be needed in part to replace combat forces and any clarification should take care to avoid suggesting that the draft would not be used for combat replacement forces;
- Recognition that past drafts have not been used solely to replace combat forces; and
- Recognition that a future draft may require forces with special skills.

An amendment was offered to remove “*of sufficient standards and*” from the first bullet to clarify and simplify the language.

At 1023 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amendment, which passed by voice vote. Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

Proposals on SSS Registration Sequencing

At 10:25 am ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on whether the Commission should recommend either maintaining pre-mobilization registration or suspending pre-mobilization registration in favor of a post-mobilization registration process. The key points of discussion included:

- A concern that moving to a post-mobilization registration process could make it difficult for the country to respond to an existential threat, including potentially asymmetric or cyber-based attacks, without mechanisms in place to convene a draft; and
- A concern about vulnerability if the all-volunteer force (AVF) were left without proper support.

The Chairman then introduced two amendments. The first amendment would ensure that, in the event of a post-mobilization registration scenario, the President would have the authority to activate registration before Congress votes on the draft. This amendment would address an objection to limiting a post-mobilization registration system to a post-draft scenario. Staff noted this would leave undetermined whether registration should be active or passive, and that the President currently has the authority to turn on or off the registration system. With this amendment, the second option would be revised: amend the MSSA to suspend the current registration practices and authorize the President to reinstate registration in the time and manner of his or her choosing.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The second amendment would only permit a shift to post-mobilization registration upon certification that it is a feasible system. Commissioners discussed limitations to this approach, with one view that the MSSA would require an amendment for a certification trigger to work. Another perspective was that the Commission should not leave it to others to determine whether a post-mobilization system could work, but instead should have the confidence to recommend a post-mobilization system. There was also a debate on who could perform the certification and what would need to be certified.

At 1130 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal to either maintain the current SSS pre-mobilization registration requirement or amend the MSSA to suspend active, pre-mobilization registration in favor of passive, post-mobilization registration. By voice vote, the Commission supported the proposal to maintain a pre-mobilization registration posture. As a result, there was no need to vote on the second option or the amendments.

The Commissioners then broke for lunch, with the plan to reconvene at 1230 ET.

Enhance Pre-Mobilization Registration Processes

At 1230 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on the three recommendations to enhance a pre-mobilization registration processes: encourage solemnity, strengthen due process for those who fail to register, and include a box for those who intend to file conscientious objector (CO) status.

Proposal to Enhance Solemnity

The original proposal presented to the Commission was to *amend the MSSA to require the SSS to develop additional methods to convey the obligation for military service in the event of a draft, which would be made available at the point of registration.*

An amendment was offered to change the word “require” to “encourage.” The Commission rejected this amendment by voice vote. The key points of discussion included how best to incentivize the SSS, the need for an appropriation, and the roles of the President and Congress in encouraging solemnity.

The Commission then addressed implementation guidance in the proposal suggested that registrants would watch a video and receive educational materials about the potential obligation of compulsory military service. Commissioners raised concerns with this approach, noting that a mandatory video would be difficult to implement if information was still being collected through State DMVs. A suggestion was made that registrants could get a note that states that the registration isn’t complete until the individual viewed the video. An alternative was also offered that involved a ceremony with a state, local, federal, or tribal judge. There was also some discomfort with the bullets on implementation in general, with individuals noting this should be a high-level recommendation without telling SSS what tools to use. The danger to this approach is that the context and implementation ideas will get lost in the Final Report.

The Commissioners agreed to vote on an edited version of the proposal, which did not include the implementation language. It read: *The Commission recommends that Congress amend the*

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

MSSA to require the SSS to develop and implement methods to convey to registrants the solemn obligation for military service in the event of a draft and appropriate such funds as are appropriate to accomplish this. The Commission adopted this recommendation by voice vote.

Proposal to Improve Due Process for Those Denied Benefits

The original proposal presented to the Commission included three recommendations: requiring a report to Congress on the current state of the appeal process; requiring an annual report on adjudication requests; and creating a new adjudication process for advisory letters. Five amendments were introduced and debated.

- The first amendment would eliminate civil penalties for failure to register with the SSS: *"The Commission recommends that Congress pass legislation repealing those provisions of federal law that penalize individuals for failing to register and instead grant amnesty for those who violated federal laws for a failure to register. The Commission encourage states to grant amnesty for a failure to register consistent with those steps taken by the federal government."* Proponents of this amendment argued that not only are the penalties themselves inequitable along socio-economic lines, because they only hurt those who need federal loans or want to be public servants, they are also inequitably enforced. Proponents contended that there should be a legal requirement to register, but that the current system for punishing a lack of enforcement was counterproductive and should instead be focused on supporting cultural pressure to do one's civic duty. Opponents argued that if the Commission improves solemnity, it will fix the uneven knowledge gaps. Additionally, it is not fair to draft those who may serve and die, if others just ignore their obligation to register.
- The second amendment would remove all penalties until the age of 45: *"The Commission recommends that Congress pass legislation removing civil penalties and maintain government aid and job prohibitions until age 45."* Advocates noted that most individuals will have applied for a federal job or loan by the age of 45, if they ever do so, and it should greatly decrease the number of people who are subject to the penalties. The recommendation is contingent upon a latter proposal to expand the registration window. Opponents argued that this will remove the pressure for people to register at age 18.
- The third amendment would allow a 30-day opportunity to "cure" a failure to register: *"Amend the MSSA to provide any individual who has been denied a federal benefit due to non-registration with the SSS to have an opportunity to register within thirty (30) days, no matter the individual's age at the time of denial, and become eligible for the benefit denied."* Advocates contended that a "cure period" would give people a chance to redeem a failure to register, even if after the age of registration has passed. The concept was clarified so that if you apply for a federal job, you can register at that time.
- The fourth amendment would put the burden on the government rather than the individual to show that failure to register was knowing and willful. The result would be to make SSS provide evidence that a failure to register was knowing and willful before

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

asserting that a benefit should be denied. This amendment was only to be offered if the third amendment failed.

- The fifth amendment would strike the two recommendations that related to the adjudication process, keeping only one of the original recommendations, the one that required an initial report to Congress.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on each of the amendments. The first and second amendments—to eliminate all civil penalties and to stop penalties until the individual is age 45—were rejected. The third amendment—to permit a cure period—passed by voice vote, which led the fourth amendment to be withdrawn. The final amendment, to strike two recommendations related to adjudications, passed by voice vote.

Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the amended recommendation. The Commission adopted the recommendation as amended.

Proposal to Allow Conscientious Objectors (COs) to Indicate CO Status at Time of Registration

Chairman Heck read aloud the primary recommendation in this proposal, to require the SSS to include a means of designating an intent to file for conscientious objector (CO) status on SSS registration materials. No amendments were offered for this proposal.

During the group discussion of the proposal, arguments for and against adding a box in the registration materials were raised. Everyone agreed that adding a box would mean nothing in the draft adjudication process because the SSS does not acknowledge the intent to file as a CO during its decision.

The central argument against adding a box was that it would be an implementation disaster, because it would create confusion and a false expectation that individuals are exempt. Opponents noted that there are other categories of people who would get automatic exemptions for medical reasons, who do not have a box to check, and there is no reason COs should be treated as special. It was also noted that some stakeholders have argued that the local board process works to fairly evaluate the COs, and this box does not provide them any protection. Arguments for adding a box included the COs deserve our respect for their passion and commitment to this process; they are different from the draft resisters and their religious belief against even registering should be valued; and it takes little effort to recognize their faith and would not disrupt the process. Advocates noted that there should be a warning that checking the box will not influence the adjudication board's decision.

A general question was raised of whether an entire generation would just check the box or whether this could be used as a platform for opposing registration. Some Commissioners argued that the Final Report can acknowledge our bad history of dealing with COs, while explaining that the current system is good and solid. A concern that an unintended consequence of this recommendation would be more CO changes or more confusion amongst board members.

At 1445 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal. The Commission rejected the proposal by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The Commission then took a 15-minute break.

Civic Education and Service-Learning Proposals

At 1500 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion of the proposals related to civic education. Commissioners Gearan and Davidson were absent and had provided proxies to other Commissioners in accordance with the Amended Business Rules. The Commissioners took a 20-minute break in the midst of this discussion.

Initially, the Commissioners debated a proposal to reorganize the civics materials to have two key recommendations—focused on civics education and service-learning programs for pre-kindergarten through 12th grade—and move all other materials into an appendix. It was argued that this approach would focus the report on the big changes that could be made by the Federal government. The rest of the materials would move into an appendix. Draft language for the civic education section was presented as:

“The Commission recommends that Congress provide \$[200 million each year] to states, IHEs, and organizations, via the Department of Education, to develop and implement best practice curricula that incorporate civic education and action civics programs across the K-12 experience with a goal of all public school students exposed by 2032 and a demonstrated [50]% increase in NAEP Civic Scores.”

The debate on this proposal touched on:

- Whether the money should go to curriculum or teacher development;
- Whether CNCS or the Department of Education would control these funds;
- Whether there should be one joint fund or two distinct funds;
- Whether to extend these programs to pre-kindergarteners;
- How to include home schooled kids; and
- Consistent usage of terms such as “semester” and “school year.”

Chairman Heck then shifted the discussion to a review of each original memo on civics and their related, proposed amendments. There were four original memos.

The first memo focused on encouraging non-federal education authorities to deliver quality civic education to all K-12 students. Four amendments were offered.

- The first amendment would change language in recommendation 1(B)(1), to include the term “non-partisan” or “apolitical.” The goal of the amendment is to ensure class discussions do not lead to tensions at home. The amendment was supported unanimously and adopted.
- The second amendment was to recommendation 1(C). It added the term “service-learning” throughout the section and add a new 1(C)(7) that was focused exclusively on service-learning issues. All of these changes were supported by the Commissioners and adopted.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- The third amendment, to include “service-learning” language throughout 1(D), was withdrawn given the overall proposal to reorganize the civics materials.
- A fourth amendment was to strike 1(C)(2) to avoid people teaching only to a civics test. It was also withdrawn given the overall proposal to reorganize.

Chairman Heck then called for a vote to adopt the amended best practice recommendations and include them in an implementation annex to the Final Report rather than in the main body of the Report. The Commission adopted this approach by voice vote.

The second memo focused on encouraging institutions of higher education (IHEs) to improve their civic education and service-learning efforts. Three amendments were offered.

- The first amendment was a series of small wording corrections to ensure that the language consistently references “service learning” and does not inappropriately use the term “work.” These were adopted unanimously.
- The second amendment was to strike references to specific programs in 2(B) so as to avoid the suggestion of favoritism. It was suggested that the examples may be appropriate in the narrative portion of the Final Report, and that describing the qualities being sought is more appropriate. The amendment was adopted unanimously.
- The third amendment was to add a specific reference to the “College of Social Innovation,” but it was withdrawn given the previous discussion. It was requested that a reference to the program be included in the narrative instead.

Chairman Heck then called for a vote to adopt the amended recommendations and include them in an annex. This approach was adopted unanimously.

The third memo focused on enhancing civic education and service-learning through Federal action. Three amendments were offered.

- The first amendment was to add “service learning” to recommendations 3(A)(2) and 3(A)(5).
- The second amendment was to strike 3(A)(7), to fund a mobile constitution center, because it was too in the weeds. Commissioners compared it to the Vietnam Wall mobile efforts and noted that it helps rural communities or individuals who cannot travel easily. Concerns were raised about who would pay for this and which Federal office should be responsible for it. In the end a proposal was made to combine the concept with recommendation 1(A)(6), emphasizing the need to reach rural communities.
- The third amendment was to ensure that recommendation 3(A)(1) specifically addresses Title 2 and Title 4 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, so grant money would go to curriculum development and to prepare teachers. Several Commissioners spoke in favor of this amendment.

Commissioners adopted each of these amendments by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The fourth memo focused on encouraging robust service-learning opportunities and funding pilot programs. The key amendment was to revise the recommendations, so that the opportunities would build on each other, such as starting service-learning projects in elementary school, summer of service programs for 8th to 10th graders, and semester of service programs in high school. It was clarified that schools and individuals would not be mandated to adopt these programs, but rather the government would provide 3-year-long grants, which should be matched by other sources. The proposal included the goal of have 1 million kids a year doing a summer of service and 1 million kids a year doing a semester of service by 2032. Topics covered in the discussion included:

- That opportunity zones might not have a matching fund requirement;
- Where the numbers provided derived from;
- How home-schooled kids could participate; and
- The need to focus this on elementary and secondary students.

Chairman Heck called for a vote and the Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote. This vote led to the withdrawal of other amendments, as they became moot under the revised language. The proposal also led individuals to request certain terms be included in the Final Report glossary.

The original civics materials included a draft model code for states to consider. An amendment was offered to the model code, to include some reference as to how the members of the youth advisory council established in the code would be selected. This change was adopted by voice vote.

Finally, the Commissioners reviewed amendments to add voting as a topic throughout the recommendations. Two different approaches were presented: the first was to explicitly call on civics curriculum to address the voting process while the second was to call on schools to provide more opportunities for voting registration. While there was general consensus in support of the first approach, the second approach raised several concerns, including that it would:

- Increase partisan presences and tensions within schools;
- Undermine the credibility of the Commission;
- Not be effective, because most students are too young to register;
- Contradict the current best practices of CNCS and state programs;
- Cause a distraction from learning; and
- Inappropriately permit teachers, instead of parents, to influence the political leanings of children.

Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the proposal to increase voting registration at schools. The Commission rejected this proposal by voice vote. Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the proposal to emphasize voting as part of the curriculum. The Commission adopted this proposal by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The Commissioners then discussed what overarching recommendations should be presented for the civics materials. Mr. Lekas displayed the earlier proposed language on a screen and the Commissioners went through a series of edits to clarify and tighten the paragraph. The general approach adopted is to describe the overall system of civics education and service learning together, but then explain the two different pieces.

The Commissioners settled on \$450 million per year for ten years for the overall request to Congress. Civics would receive \$200 million per year with the goal of a 50% increase in NAEP testing and a certain number of students reached. The service-learning fund would receive \$250 and be split across the three program areas described above. The Commissioners discussed how this compared to STEM investment and noted that information on the return on investment is critical. The Final Report should show that this is a good investment and that the programs are not secret child labor or a way to avoid paying workers for their actual work.

At 1800, Chairman Heck asked Mr. Lekas to prepare a revised version of the proposal reflecting the Commission's discussion to be voted later in the week. The Commission then ended the meeting for the day.

July 16, 2019

Civic Education and Service-Learning Proposals

At 0800 ET, the Commission reconvened. The Commission held a a short discussion on the civic education proposals. With respect to best practices for high school, an amendment was offered that required an end-of-year exam to assess civics knowledge. Chairman Heck called for a vote and this amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The Commissioners then agreed that in the overarching recommendation for the civic education proposals, the Commission should propose \$200 million in funding for a Civic Education Fund, with an overarching goal of a 50% increase in civics courses and increased exposure.

Service Registration System Proposal

Chairman Heck then initiated a discussion on a proposal to create a service registration system (SRS).

The Commissioners began by discussing potential names for the SRS, acknowledging "SRS" as a placeholder. Several Commissioners supported the name "Serve America," despite other uses of that phrase. Commissioners discarded "United We Serve" as an option because it was the name of an Obama-era program that included development of the serve.gov website.

Proposal to Establish a Service Registration System

Chairman Heck then opened the floor for discussion on the recommendation to establish the SRS. Some Commissioners expressed concerns about the difficulty of the government running this kind of database, the potential waste of Federal resources, and potentially limited public interest. They wondered if a platform like the proposed SRS would be more effective if administered by the private sector.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Other Commissioners highlighted that lack of tools available to raise awareness of service opportunities as well as the benefits of exposing people to the breadth of available service options. These Commissioners recognized the risk that individuals may not be initially inclined to go it and use it, noting that the government would have to develop a plan to mitigate that risk. There was some discussion about the option of using the private sector to develop, maintain, or bolster the website.

Chairman Heck then focused the discussion on amendments offered on the SRS proposal.

- *The first amendment* would voluntarily link LinkedIn profiles to the new system. Advocates noted that LinkedIn was the best source for information on people's skills and would take advantage of a pre-existing database. There was a short discussion of whether other professional networking databases should be linked as well.
- *The second amendment* would put GSA in charge of the system with oversight by the new Lead Service Authority. Proponents argued that GSA is more advanced with contracting vehicles and technology and could serve as a neutral third party. Commissioners also suggested OMB as an alternative, given its interagency coordination power. Another option was to split responsibilities, with GSA hosting, the Lead Service Authority providing policy direction and oversight, and the GAO issuing reports on the system as it develops. Some Commissioners felt this direction would be too detail-oriented and preferred presenting the proposal as a big idea without this level of detail.
- *The third amendment* would eliminate language in the recommendation for a five-year funding period and replace it with multi-year funding.

Based on Commissioner discussion of these amendments, Chairman Heck presented a revised proposal that would require the President to establish the system and the Congress to authorize and appropriate multi-year funds for the system. Additionally, Chairman Heck presented revisions to the implementation guidance as follows:

- GSA, on behalf of the Lead Service Authority, would host the system and provide annual reports to Congress on the system's performance;
- All Federal agencies would be required to participate in the SRS;
- Periodic reviews of the SRS, including GSA's management and administration, would be required;
- The SSS would be required to include a mechanism for individuals registering with the SSS to opt into the SRS; and
- The Commission would recommend the President to direct the SSS to include information about the SRS with SSS registration confirmations.

Chairman Heck tabled the vote on this proposal until later in the day. He noted that the amendment to identify a host of the SRS had been incorporated into this amended proposal and would not receive a separate vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Later in the afternoon, from 1620 to 1630, the Commission revisited the SRS proposal. Chairman Heck presented the amended proposal as set forth above with one overarching recommendation and five points for implementation guidance. The recommendation would also include, as implementing guidance, portions of the proposal to create a national roster of volunteers; that proposal is addressed later in these Minutes. Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal, which passed by voice vote.

Lead Service Authority

At 1000, Chairman Heck turned to the proposal for a Lead Service Authority (LSA) and focused the Commission on a staff memo presenting options for discussion. The Commission considered:

- Whether the LSA should be structured as a council or an agency;
- Whether the head of the LSA should be included in the President's Cabinet and how best to accomplish that;
- Whether the LSA should serve as the interagency lead for critical skills; and
- Whether the LSA should be led by an individual whose position is senate-confirmed to give Congress a vested interest in the organization.

Commissioners also considered the overarching mission of the LSA. They suggested various potential mission goals, including elevating service, coordinating interagency efforts, and holding agencies accountable. In addition to these topics, Commissioners expressed a desire to describe and use the LSA consistently across the recommendations, and to emphasize the importance of volunteers and coordination with state governors in the Final Report.

Ms. Haines suggested reaching out for advice on this concept to former White House Chief of Staff Jack Lew, and with the agreement of other Commissioners, Chairman Heck tabled the vote until after she had conducted the consultation and could report back to the Commission.

Selective Service System Proposals

Voluntary Systems Proposals

From 1040 to 1410 ET, the Commission considered a series of proposals involving the SSS, which focused on creating new voluntary systems to generate personnel in the event of a national emergency. The discussion covered three topics: a call for volunteers, a national roster, and a Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) for individuals with critical skills. The Commissioners broke for an hour-lunch during this time period. All Commissioners were present for this discussion.

Proposal for the President to Issue a Call for Volunteers

Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on the proposal for a Presidential call for volunteers, which contained three recommendations. The goal of these recommendations is to increase end strength before moving to a draft, while also alerting the Nation's allies and adversaries of U.S. national resolve. Commissioners from the SSS Work Group discussed how the call for volunteers, as

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL

proposed, would be iterative and with increasingly broader scope, with a goal of institutionalizing the “call” process so a draft would be used only as a drastic last step.

Staff explained how the call for volunteers would interact with the proposal to create a national roster, which the Commission considered next. The national roster proposal would allow individuals to check a box at the time of SSS registration to indicate an interest volunteering for service in the event of a national emergency requiring an influx of military personnel. The President would issue a call for volunteers in the event that further personnel were required, and the Nation would pursue a draft only if those two channels did not generate enough personnel for the particular emergency. Commissioners discussed ways to encourage SSS registrants of the national roster option over time, such as through email reminders.

To the “call for volunteers” proposal, an amendment was offered that would clarify that the call for volunteers should be done by whatever methods are determined the most effective. Commissioners noted that the new SRS might be one of those methods. Some Commissioners expressed concern that an explicit reference to the SRS could suggest that the Commission views it as a backdoor for the draft or that the call for volunteers would not be limited to national security needs. Other Commissioners recommended not referencing the SRS on the grounds that if the President could use any database, then naming just one of them would be unhelpful.

Commissioners considered the kind of emergencies that would justify a call for volunteers. Some Commissioners argued that “national security emergency” is the right term and derives from an Executive Order. Other Commissioners pointed to the MSSA, which uses the term “national emergency.” One suggestion was to revise the language to remove references to national emergencies altogether, such as “call for volunteers before exercising a draft contingency.”

Based on discussion, Chairman Heck proposed that the amended recommendation for voting would read as follows: “The Commission recommends that the President issue an EO setting out a policy for issuing a call for volunteers before exercising a draft contingency.” Chairman Heck called for a vote on this recommendation, and it passed by voice vote.

Commissioners then discussed a second, related recommendation that included detail on how the call for volunteers would be implemented. Some Commissioners felt omitting that detail could infringe on the overarching incremental approach and could undermine a broader goal of encouraging people to think about volunteering more broadly. Chairman Heck called for a vote on this recommendation, which failed by voice vote.

Proposal to Create a National Roster

At 1315 ET, Chairman Heck turned to the proposal to establish a national roster, comprised of information on individuals from a broader group of individuals than the 18-26-year-old cohort, who have expressed willingness to join the military during a national mobilization. The roster would also indicate any critical skills that the individual has. This proposal was intended to be distinct from creating a skills roster for broader volunteer opportunities, such as may be part of the new service registration system.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The Commissioners debated:

- Where the information on a national roster should be held—within the SSS or within the new SRS, noting that using the SSS database may pose challenges since registrants may not visit the SSS website;
- Whether the information should be shared only with DoD, more broadly with appropriate Federal agencies, or also to national service organizations;
- Potential privacy concerns with sharing information in a national roster;
- How to or whether to incorporate information about skillsets and certifications; and
- What kind of emergencies would justify use of the roster, including possible emergencies not involving national security.

The Commission then discussed the national roster proposal in the context of the SRS. They considered whether information in the SRS should be automatically shared or controlled by the registrants, with a general consensus that individuals should opt-in to sharing their information with military service organizations, and that individuals' information could be shared automatically with national and public service organizations so long as proper notice was given to users and they have an opportunity to opt out. Commissioners recommended addressing these points in the narrative about the SRS proposal.

Chairman Heck then noted that the national roster proposal seems best addressed in the Commission's proposal to create a SRS. He called for a vote to strike the proposal for a national roster as a distinct proposal. By voice vote, the Commission voted to strike the proposal and address it as a feature of the SRS.

Proposal to Establish a Critical Skills Individual Ready Reserve (IRR)

At 1340 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion of the proposal to encourage DoD to recruit, train, and maintain an IRR of personnel with critical skills. Commissioners agreed to changes in the presentation of the recommendation, so that it simply read that DoD should "establish" the program, instead of outlining the specific policy steps.

The Commission discussed three different proposals to create new programs to attract people to service during an emergency: a civilian cyber corps, a skill-based draft, and the IRR. An amendment was offered to pull these options together into one comprehensive program. Supporters of this amendment reasoned it would simplify funding requests and bring holistic attention to this topic. Some Commissioners raised questions about who could access individuals through these programs and what distinctions would be made between uniformed and civilian personnel. Some Commissioners felt this issue concerned the Final Report's presentation of information. Based on the foregoing, the amendment was withdrawn in lieu of discussing how the programs interact in the narrative of the Final Report.

At 1410ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended, which was adopted by voice vote. The Commission then took a five-minute break.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Proposal to Extend Registration to All Americans

At 1415 ET, the Commission reconvened, with Dr. Davidson joining by phone. Chairman Heck introduced the proposal to require all Americans to register for selective service. No amendments were offered.

The Commission discussed use of the system for combat replacements, and how that view impacts one's view of registering women. Some Commissioners expressed concern about public confusion concerning the historical use of the draft in the United States and how a draft could be used in the future – in both cases, for uses not limited to combat replacement. Based on this discussion, the Commission revisited its discussion of July 15th regarding the purpose of the draft. It was proposed that the recommendation adopted by the Commission be further amended to include a recommendation that Congress amend the MSSA “to clarify that selective service registration is not solely to draft combat replacement troops.” Chairman Heck called for a vote. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The Commission then returned to the proposal to extend registration to all Americans. Concerns raised by Commissioners against this proposal included the following:

- Requiring women to register would result in an inequitable arrangement because women could use exemptions and deferments more easily than men;
- Registration of women would devalue families and women's special role in society as mothers, daughters, and wives;
- Registration of women would undermine efforts to ask women to serve in other ways;
- The achievements of women who serve now as volunteers should not place a mandate on the rest of society to do the same;
- Women are more prone to injury and requiring them to register would expose them to a greater risk than men; and
- Women lack the lethality of men and requiring women to register is less about national security than about social change.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal. The Commission held a roll call vote. The proposal was rejected by a vote of seven in favor and four against.

Several Commissioners requested an opportunity to respond to the concerns raised. Points raised by those supporting the proposal included the following:

- There is not a legitimate basis for drawing a distinction between women and men for purposes of registration rather than service and doing so instead reinforces paternalistic gender stereotypes about the role of women in society;
- Not all men are in a position or capable of performing combat jobs, yet all men must register, even if they have health limitations or are single parents;

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- To make the country safe, the Nation must have the best people available, and, at some point, the Nation may need everyone to be available, including women, who may have strengths that on average are superior to those of men (such as sharp shooting);
- Americans have made it clear they are ready for this change, including most of the public the Commission met with, especially young people, who view registering as an equality issue, not a social experiment;
- By not registering women, the Nation is communicating that their contributions to national security are worth less than those of men;
- Not requiring women to register makes clear that the government is of the view that women in the armed forces are not absolutely necessary to defend the country in the event of a national emergency and consequently undercuts recruitment messaging and disempowers women in the armed forces; and
- The system has multiple checks to avoid concerns raised, including a process for deferments and assignments, and registration must not be seen as identical to the draft itself.

Supporters of the proposal noted the potential to reopen the Commission's vote in the event any opponent of the proposal reconsidered. Supporters also asked as a point of order that if the vote stands, the Final Report reflect the actual vote on this topic and reflect additional views on the topic, since it was a central mandate from Congress. Commissioners seemed generally supportive of this approach. Chairman Heck promised to raise the topic of additional views later in the week for a formal decision.

At 1525 ET, Chairman Heck closed the discussion and the Commission took a ten-minute break.

Structure of the Draft Proposals

From 1535 to 1620 ET, Chairman Heck led a discussion on reforming the structure of the draft. The discussion covered three topics: expanding the age of the draft-eligible population; extending the duration of the service obligation; creating a mechanism to account for the skills of conscripted individuals; and endorsing the Health Care Personnel Delivery System as a model. All Commissioners were present for this discussion, with Dr. Davidson joining by telephone.

Proposal to Expand the Age of the Draft-Eligible Population

The proposal included two recommendations to amend the MSSA: first, to increase the upper age limit of the eligible population to a limit set by Congress during activation; second, to require a multi-year lottery and selection process.

The only amendment offered would expand the age cohort for registration to 18-to-45 years. Supporters of the amendment felt the expanded range would ensure that individuals with special skills, such as medical knowledge, would be included in the pool of draft eligible individuals. Opponents noted the optics of requiring all men to be registered for such a long period of time, given other Commission recommendations.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amendment, and it failed by voice vote. Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the proposal as originally drafted. The original proposal also failed by voice vote.

Proposal to Extend the Duration of Conscripted Individual's Service Obligation

The proposal would amend MSSA to extend the length of conscripted terms of service to no more than the duration of a conflict plus six months, unless otherwise released by the Secretary of Defense. It had an additional recommendation focused on amending the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) to extend reemployment rights to individuals who are conscripted into active-duty service. No amendments were offered for the proposal.

Staff explained that the current two-year limit on conscripted service presents challenges because so much of that time is spent in required training. The proposal would treat conscripted forces in the same manner as regular forces. Some Commissioners questioned whether the topic fell within the Commission's mandate.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal, and it failed by voice vote.

Proposal to Create a Mechanism to Account for the Skills of Conscripted Individuals

The proposal would encourage SSS to establish a mechanism for identifying special skills or abilities during the induction process. The only amendment offered was withdrawn.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal, and it failed by voice vote.

Proposal to Endorse the HCPDS as a Model for a "Skills Draft."

The proposal would endorse the Health Care Personnel Delivery System (HCPDS) as a model and recommend that Congress require the SSS to implement regulations to govern conscription in the event of a "skills draft." No amendments were offered.

Commissioners questioned support for the HCPDS model, including whether it had been tested or endorsed as a viable model. Staff explained the benefits and challenges it poses as a model but noted that HCPDS had never been fully implemented. Staff explained that HCPDS is designed to identify individuals from a population of professionals with state licenses and that approach may not translate well to identify skilled individuals without state licensure requirements. Several Commissioners suggested that the HCPDS may be best addressed in the narrative of the Final Report rather than as a formal recommendation.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal, and it failed by voice vote.

National Mobilization Proposals

At 1630 ET, after a ten-minute discussion of the SRS proposal (see above), the Commission deliberated on a series of bundled proposals for revising the Selective Service System. There were three distinct proposals discussed during this session.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

1. Proposal to Improve the Health of our National Mobilization system

Chairman Heck began a discussion on a proposal consisting of three recommendations to improve mobilization mechanisms by requiring regular exercises of DoD and SSS's respective functions. Two amendments were discussed.

The first amendment would require DoD to conduct a system test in 2023 in which all planned summer accessions plus DEP are moved through MEPS and accession processing and recruit training to see how the system would absorb large numbers of conscripts. Commissioners opposed to the amendment highlighted the potential cost and difficulty and suggested a better course would be to discuss DoD's likely challenges with mass induction in the narrative of the report. The amendment was withdrawn.

The second amendment would recommend that the President encourage DoD and SSS to jointly conduct table-top exercises and provide Congress with a report. Some Commissioners questioned whether the SSS and DoD both needed to be involved in these exercises and what resources would be required. Commissioners also discussed the frequency of the proposed exercise, with a suggestion that it be done no more than every four years, which would ensure that each SSS Director participates in an exercise during their term.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the second amendment, and it was adopted by voice vote. Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the amended proposal, which passed by voice vote.

2. Proposal to Improve National Mobilization Requirements

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included five recommendations to create accountability by designating and empowering a central "voice" to represent national mobilizations within DoD and to cultivate best practices. Some Commissioners questioned whether the proposal was within the Commission's mandate.

One amendment was discussed, which would explicitly name the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness as the lead national mobilization executive agent. Chairman Heck called for a vote on this amendment, and it was adopted by voice vote.

Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the amended proposal, and it passed by voice vote.

3. Proposal to Streamline Existing Deferments and Exemptions

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included a recommendation to modernize deferments and exemptions to create a more transparent, fair, and equitable process.

Commissioners presented amendments that reflected general discomfort in making changes to the deferment and exemption system without further study. Specifically, the Commission considered an amendment to direct the Executive Branch to conduct a study and make suggestions on how to change the system of deferments and exemptions within 120 days. Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amendment, and it was adopted by voice vote.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal, and it passed by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

At 1800 ET, the Commissioners then closed their deliberations for the day, with the plan to reconvene the next morning at 0800 ET.

July 17, 2019

Initial Business Matters

At 0800 ET, the Commission reconvened, and Chairman Heck reviewed the planned votes for the day. He tabled, until completion of deliberation and voting on public service proposals, a request to reopen the Commission's vote on July 16 on the recommendation to extend Selective Service registration to all Americans.

Chairman Heck recognized Brian Collins, Research Team Lead for Public Service, to address certain of the proposed amendments to the public service proposals. Those amendments would relocate proposed recommendations to an implementation annex and replace them in the text of the Final Report with overarching, broader recommendations. Mr. Collins felt relocating the recommendations in this manner would detract from their effectiveness. Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of this approach and resolved to include best practices and implementation guidance for each recommendation area in an annex and review critically on a case-by-case basis which recommendations must remain in the text of the Final Report. Dr. Rough supported this approach.

National Service Proposals

Proposals on Competitive Hiring

Chairman Heck then turned the conversation to the competitive hiring proposals, which included four major recommendations with multiple subparts. The Commissioners offered three amendments.

The first amendment would add a recommendation for OPM to review the interagency transfer process for existing Federal employees to remove barriers and streamline the process for both competitive and noncompetitive transfers. Commissioners discussed whether it was best to discuss the competitive and noncompetitive transfer challenges separately or together. In the end, they decided to include it in both sections of the report. The Commission approved this amendment by voice vote.

The second amendment would strike a recommendation to authorize Federal agencies to use a more flexible, ranked-list assessment option. Staff provided background on the origin of category rating system during the Obama Administration and discussed the status of forthcoming regulations expected to be issued by OPM. During the discussion, it became clear that no Commissioner opposed the underlying ideas of the recommendation, but Commissioners did have concerns about how it was presented and what implementation guidance would be provided. As a result, the amendment was withdrawn.

The final amendment would include an overarching recommendation that clarified the purpose of the changes being proposed and limited the underlying recommendations that would be presented in the text of the Final Report. Part of this revision was to change implementation

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

language that previously recommended statutory amendments to instead be “best practices” or guidance that would issue from OPM and that the Commission would include in the implementation annex. There was an overarching concern that attempting to legislate a cultural change would not be appropriate or effective. Another concern expressed was that being too detailed and prescriptive in the recommendations would dilute the broader points being made. This amendment was adopted.

After the amendments were completed, the Commissioners reviewed which language would remain the Final Report and which language would be moved to the implementation annex. The Commissioners described a desire for a cross-reference document in the implementation section, which will show where in the U.S. Code the current statutory authorities exist, to facilitate future legislative action. Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

Proposals on Noncompetitive Hiring

At 0900 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on the noncompetitive hiring proposal, which had seven recommendations. The Commissioners addressed four of the amendments expeditiously.

- An amendment to address interagency transfers, identical to the one for competitive hiring;
- An amendment to make a recommendation on standardizing non-competitive eligibility (NCE) documentation to be focused on OPM instead of Congress;
- An amendment to require OPM to develop a checklist for NCE holders failed because the Commissioners agreed that the key improvement would be better training, and the checklist would likely just be one of the materials distributed at such training; and
- An amendment that encouraged OPM to develop a better website.

The Commission adopted each amendment by voice vote.

An additional amendment to offer NCE to kids of fallen servicemembers failed, receiving fewer than eight supporting votes. Those speaking in favor of the amendment argued that military spouses now receive NCE, the VSOs would support it, and it would attract more young people to military and public service. There was some debate about whether the servicemember would have to have died in combat or in the line of duty, and how many individuals this may apply to. However, the majority of the Commissioners did not support the amendment because the extension of hiring preferences seemed politically contentious and could weaken other proposals.

The final amendment would add an overarching recommendation and move the original, non-italicized content into the implementation annex. The same amendment changed some of the language to make it consistent with the other recommendations, primarily to ensure that the President and Congress are the key actors and to remove specific references to the U.S. Code. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

At 1035 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote. The Commission then took a ten-minute break.

Proposals on Postsecondary Pipelines

At 1045 ET, the Commission reconvened, and Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on a proposal to improve postsecondary pipelines, which had two recommendations: to establish a public service corps and to create a public service academy.

Three amendments were offered for the public service corps proposal, including to make the scholarships last four years, to require students to apply for the scholarship instead of requiring participating institution to nominate students, and to reframe school's obligations to commit resources to the program. The Commission adopted all three of the amendments.

Two amendments represented new proposals. The first would propose to recommend that military academies accept a cohort of students who make a contracted commitment to serve in a public-service position after graduation. Those in support of this proposal stated that all of the details do not have to be spelled out in the Final Report, but that the measure could help break down the military-civilian divide. It was noted that the military academies would likely strongly oppose this proposal. There was a debate about who would pay for the additional cost of the students and what percentage of the student body should be in this cohort.

The second would establish a grant program to fund public service academies at fifty institutions of higher education. The number of schools could increase over time and financial support from the government would decrease to a 50-50 split once the programs are established. Details of the program were discussed, such as how long it might take to establish programs.

At 1135 ET, the amended proposals were voted on. By voice vote, the Commission rejected the proposal to create a public service academy and adopted the proposals to create a public service corps, to create a public service cohort at military service academies, and to create a public service academy grant program.

The Commissioners then dispersed for lunch.

Proposals on Hiring Preferences

At 1230 ET, the Commission reconvened with Commissioners present, except for Dr. Davidson. Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on the hiring preferences proposal, which had six recommendations and received nine amendments.

The first amendment represented a new proposal to grant 36 months of NCE to graduates of military service academies and ROTC programs who cannot be active duty because of medical reasons. Those in support of this idea described it as a way to recapture some of the government's investment in these individuals, especially for those who really want to serve but could not pass the required physical. Currently, the tuition is normally waived by the head of the academy. Opponents of the idea were concerned that NCE is a benefit, which would be granted to someone after they just received a free education. In the end, this amendment was withdrawn.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The second amendment would strike the first recommendation to permit use of veterans' preference in competitive examining to be used only as a tiebreaker. Many Commissioners opposed this amendment and spoke to the unfairness and inefficiency of having beneficiaries of this rule jump from minimally- to highly-qualified on the list of qualified applicants. The amendment was withdrawn.

The third amendment would strike part of the second recommendation to remove the hiring preference for retirees and limit it to those applying for positions above a GS-11 position. Commissioners spoke in favor of the amendment noting that people forget that all retirees are veterans. The Commission adopted this amendment to strike by voice vote.

The fourth amendment would strike the third recommendation to permit agencies to suspend veterans' preference upon reaching a specified hiring threshold. Debate ensued on how the recommendation would function, such as whether it would create an informal cap of 25% veterans or inappropriately distinguish between veterans applying before and after the threshold is reached. Supporters of this amendment expressed concern that keeping the recommendation would undermine decades of messaging to the public and private sector focused on the importance of hiring veterans. The Commission adopted this amendment to strike by voice vote.

The fifth amendment was to expand the fourth recommendation, so that NCE would not only be extended to all AmeriCorps alumni, but also to other equivalent national service programs outside CNCS. The expansion would require OPM, in consultation with CNCS, to identify similarly situated programs. It connects to a latter proposal for a DD-214 equivalent in the national service space. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The sixth amendment was to remove language from the fourth recommendation that limits VRA to those within ten years of separation. Some Commissioners adamantly defended the original recommendation, arguing that currently retirees are getting assistance in receiving high-level positions in the government, when they should be able to compete for them and already receive retirement benefits. Proponents of the amendment contended that any policy that distinguished amongst veterans was problematic. The Commission rejected this amendment by a vote of four in favor and seven against.

The seventh amendment was to revise the fourth recommendation limits on the VRA to only veterans with a thirty percent disability. Commissioners expressed a concern that this limitation would be strongly opposed by VSOs. The Commission rejected this amendment by voice vote.

The eighth amendment was to add "qualified" to the fifth recommendation which would give NCE to high-performing employees who leave government. The Commissioners discussed how individuals clearly should be qualified for the jobs they are applying to use the NCE, but that making that determination could be messy or inconsistently done. In response to a Commissioner question, Mr. Collins noted that making stakeholders—such as nonprofits, OPM, and the current Administration—support the proposal and would appreciate this addition. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The ninth amendment was to decrease the amount of time high-performing employees would have the NCE. The original recommendation had a ten-year limit, but Commissioners concurred this is a long time and the analogy to the VRA may not be appropriate. A suggestion was made for six years, so that individuals going to the private sector can vest some of the benefits after five years before returning. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

At 1355 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

Proposals on Federal Civilian Employee Benefits

At 1415 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on the Federal benefits proposal, focusing first on an amendment to add an overarching recommendation and move the original, non-italicized content into the appendix. The same amendment would revise the proposal's language to make it consistent with the other recommendations, primarily to ensure that the President and Congress are the key actors. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

Four additional amendments were offered on the original proposal.

- The first amendment would remove an option from the first recommendation, which would create a 3-year grace period for employees selecting a new benefit options to switchback. It was generally agreed that this would be expensive and create a logistics nightmare, and that a better approach would be to require employee education on the programs before either was selected. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.
- The second amendment would require agencies to provide an annual benefit summary to employees, in addition to an estimate of benefits at the time the job is offered. This would serve as a reminder of how much the Federal government is investing in them and the non-transparent benefits of Federal employment. The Commission adopted this recommendation by voice vote.
- The third amendment would revise a recommendation on collecting data on agency-specific benefits, so as to use the currently existing Federal Employees Benefits Survey. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.
- The fourth amendment would provide different amounts of parental leave for mothers and fathers, recognizing that women have both a recovery period as well as a child bonding requirement. The Commissioners considered analogous situations in the military and private sector, as well as the option of denoting the different levels as primary and secondary caregivers. The Commission rejected this amendment by voice vote.

Finally, an amendment to add a new recommendation was offered. The amendment would require the lead service agency to create an advisory committee on benefits, which would review and develop recommendations related to Federal civilian employees' needs. While noting that

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

uniformed service benefits are very complicated and may need to be left out of this process, the Commission held a voice vote and adopted this amendment.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

Public Service Proposals - Bundle Proposals

At 1450 ET, Chairman Heck turned the discussion to the bundled proposals to revise the public service system. There were eight distinct proposals discussed during this session. All Commissioners were present for the discussion and voting, with Dr. Davidson joining on the phone for latter half.

1. Proposal to Promote a Culture that Prioritizes Strategic Workforce Planning

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included eight recommendations to promote interagency collaboration and utilization of all authorities to meet workforce needs. Seven amendments were discussed.

The first amendment would add overarching language to frame the underlying recommendations. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The second amendment would strike a recommendation to require that 35 percent of a supervisor's evaluations be based on personnel management and human capital responsibilities. Commissioners discussed alternatives to striking it, such as changing the percentage level or removing the percentage level altogether. Staff clarified that personnel management is a part of evaluations now, and the language was revised to read: *Base a reasonable percentage of the evaluation of GS and SES supervisors upon personnel management, recruiting, and human capital responsibilities.* Commissioners agreed that this would be a best practice, not a recommendation requiring the President to issue an executive order. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The third amendment would strike a recommendation to establish a temporary Personnel Transformation Office within each Federal agency. Commissioners further proposed to replace this recommendation with requirements that (1) agencies identify a position that is responsible for workforce planning, and (2) OPM provide guidance on instituting reforms. Staff explained the meaning of a "workforce plan" and the rationale for placing the onus on agency heads to lead these initiatives. Commissioners also discussed whether these efforts would be best categorized as recommendations or described in the narrative and implementation guidance. Commissioners adopted the amendment to strike and both new recommendations, described above, by voice vote.

The fourth amendment would strike a recommendation to publish annual blended workforce headcounts. Supporters of the amendment felt this recommendation was too in the weeds, that it would burden agencies, and did not have clear benefits. Opponents explained that headcounts would permit Congress and the public to hold agencies accountable about how they use

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

contractors and grantees, and that a government-wide approach would help ensure consistency in methodology. Based on this discussion, the amendment was withdrawn.

The fifth amendment would change the term “new to “existing” in a recommendation to use authorities to hire employees for multiple agencies from a single job announcement. A Commissioner explained that the authorities already exist to do this, and the Commission adopted this amendment as a technical correction.

The sixth amendment would delete implementation guidance that suggested publishing annual reports on OPM’s website of agencies hiring of underrepresented groups. Advocates noted that the reports would take time away from marketing to and recruiting underrepresented individuals. Staff clarified that some agencies already publish this information, depending on how you define underrepresented groups. The Commission adopted the amendment by voice vote.

The seventh amendment would strike the recommendation to dedicate funds within agency budgets for employee training. Commissioners raised concerns that this greatly limits agency flexibility and that dedicated funds are not used for other recommendations. Commissioners suggested including something in the narrative about the importance of investing in this area. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The eighth amendment would revise a recommendation that permits Federal agencies to communicate more freely with the public about their mission. One proposed change was to designate a certain percentage of funds to promoting agency services, but some Commissioners raised questions about how that percentage would be determined and the need to be consistent about how specific the recommendations should be. A suggestion was made to revise the recommendation to read “*The Commission recommends that Federal agencies communicate with the public about their mission and promote service, to including designating a reasonable percentage of appropriated funds for the purpose of promoting service with the agency, informing the public about agency activities and recruiting aspiring public servants.*” Mr. Lekas explained the legal structures that affect this kind of spending, and Commissioners suggested the recommendation could be amended if required as an outcome of the legislative drafting process. The amended recommendation was adopted by voice vote.

At this point, Chairman Heck reviewed where these proposals should reside within the Final Report. The Commissioners agreed that only three of the original recommendations should be kept as such in the Final Report: establishing competency standards for HR specialists, requiring agencies to appoint a lead for workforce plans, and permitting funds to be spent to promote agency services. The remaining four recommendations would be moved to an implementation appendix.

At 1550 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal, which passed by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

2. Proposal to Improve Hiring Systems for Students and Recent Graduates

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included five recommendations to establish effective platforms to enable Federal agencies to access talent from institutions of higher education. Eight amendments were discussed.

The first amendment was to add an overarching recommendation that frames the other recommendations, as well as technical changes to make the presentation of recommendations consistent throughout. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The second amendment would amend a recommendation to establish special, governmentwide hiring authorities for students and recent graduates to make hiring 30,000 individuals the maximum goal of the Pathways Program, and not the minimum that should be expected. Staff explained that the number was how many of these individuals were hired before the Pathways Program was revised in 2013. With approximately 215,000 new hirers a year, this group would make up roughly 15% of all new hirers. The current number is around 7000 students and recent graduates being hired, and the staff predicted it would reach 30,000 in five years. Some Commissioners argued that the number was too low, while others contended that there is no objective way to know the perfect number or that specifying a number here is unnecessary. The amendment failed on a vote of two in favor and nine against.

As an alternative, Commissioners include the phrase “in order to ensure a healthy ratio” as part of the implementation language, to ensure that common sense can prevail. This suggestion, along with including a five-year implementation period was adopted by voice vote.

The third amendment would change the same recommendation so that it relies on congressional action instead of an executive order. An alternative was to ask GAO to review and suggest changes to the current hiring authorities, although staff noted that GAO has already issued several aggressive audits of OPM. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The fourth amendment would add language to a recommendation revising the Pathways Internship Program to try to ensure that the program is used to bring in young adults, instead of people nearing retirement. Staff suggested that the problem may have more to do with veterans’ preference within competitive examining, which would be resolved by direct hiring authority. Mr. Lekas also noted that a potential conflict with the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. The amendment was withdrawn.

The fifth amendment would add a new recommendation requiring all Federal agencies to pay all interns. Staff clarified that all Pathway Program participants are paid and there is a prohibition on accepting voluntary services for some agencies. However, some agencies may accept voluntary services as gifts and they use externship programs, where students receive credit, to justify not paying students. Advocates for this proposal noted that not paying interns keeps low income individuals from opportunities and perpetuates a division of who can serve the public. Commissioners also discussed whether to extend the proposal to congressional interns, ultimately without any Commissioner proposing an amendment to do so. The Commission adopted the recommendation by a vote of 8-3.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The sixth amendment would add a new recommendation requiring Congress to fund the Virtual Student Federal Service, so the participants are paid. Staff explained that the service is a voluntary, unpaid program that lets students work on specific projects for participating Federal agencies. There was a short debate on this proposal, with supports arguing that the class distinction that exists for in-person interns exists here as well. However, opponents noted the students connect to the agencies virtually, so there should be limited, if any, additional living costs incurred. The Commission rejected this amendment by voice vote.

The seventh amendment would add a new recommendation that authorizes OPM to allow agencies to conduct a demonstration program for the hiring of graduates with critical skills. The focus on critical skills would limit the use of the program, helping to ensure that it would not undermine the rest of the hiring scheme. Commissioners suggested that the new lead service agency may be a good place for identifying the critical skills that can be focused on with these demonstrations. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The eighth amendment would add a new recommendation that requires graduates of military service academies and ROTC programs who do not commission for medical reasons to complete a five-year service commitment in civil service employment. This requirement would permit waivers for individuals who cannot serve in this other capacity and may be scalable for individuals who do not complete their education. It would impact approximately 10-20 individuals per class. Some Commissioners strongly opposed this amendment noting that it seems like a big logistical burden for a small number of individuals. They questioned the practicality of implementing it. The amendment failed by a vote of 2-9.

Chairman Heck then reviewed where these proposals should reside within the Final Report. The Commissioners agreed that five of the original recommendations should be kept as such in the Final Report: establishing special, governmentwide hiring authorities for students, requiring OPM to streamline hiring interns, increasing the statutory cap on direct hires of students, mandating all Federal internships be paid, and authorizing agencies to conduct demonstration programs for hiring students with critical skills. The remaining two recommendations would be included in the implementation annex and not in the text to the Final Report.

At 1650 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal, which passed by voice vote. The Commissioners held an executive session for ten minutes, before breaking for dinner.

3. Proposal to Transform and Expand Fellowship and Scholarship Programs

The Commission reconvened at 1830 ET, with Dr. Davidson joining by phone. Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included three recommendations to develop specialized talent to meet Federal agency workforce needs.

The first set of amendment would revise language in a recommendation that establishes a Federal Fellowship Center within OPM. The changes, which were all adopted by voice vote without significant debate, included:

- Revising the name of the center to include the term “scholarship”;

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- Adding a supervisor role for the new lead service agency;
- Requiring that the center be led by a career-SES who has a five-year term; and
- Ensuring that the fellowships are defined to avoid programs that are not Federally sponsored.

There was also a discussion of whether this recommendation should be tied to a proposed national service fellowship program, as a way to view these issues more comprehensively. In the end, the Commissioners endorsed not directly linking the two proposals.

The second amendment would strike a recommendation supporting retention of the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program. Supporters of the amendment argued that the program is distinct from fellowships or scholarships, and so it does not fit neatly in this section. They also argued that the program could reach 25% of the population, the percentage with student loan debt, and is not fiscally responsible. If there is no threat to the program, these supporters stated there is no point to referencing it in the report. Opponents of the amendment contended that the loan forgiveness program has served as a major tool to increase propensity for public service, and that the Commission's silence on this program, which has been under threat, also communicates something. There was also some dispute as to the financial impact on the nation relative to the individuals involved. Commissioners found a compromise by agreeing that the topic should be discussed in the narrative of the report, without naming it as a specific recommendation. The amendment was then adopted by voice vote.

The third amendment would add a new recommendation to require third-party fellows to fulfill their fellowship requirement only through Federal employment. Opponents pointed to the example of the Boren Fellows Program, which started in the early 1990s to gain critical language skills to help DoD. In subsequent years, fellows could not get jobs in government, so Congress permitted them to get jobs as contractors or to go to the private sector if fellows continue to be unsuccessful getting a job. Staff explained they do not know how widespread this issue is. In the end, the amendment was withdrawn.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended, and the Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

4. Proposal to Improve Personnel Systems for Federal Health Care Professionals

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included three recommendations to establish efficient personnel systems and policies that can compete with the private sector for health care talent. Two amendments were discussed.

The first amendment would add an overarching recommendation to frame the discrete underlying recommendations and would make technical changes for consistency. The Commission adopted all these changes without discussion.

The second amendment would strike a recommendation to establish a pilot program to develop specialized pathways for military service members and veterans to become physician assistants. Advocates of the amendment noted that individuals must have a BA degree to attend physician

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL

assistant school and that there are varying degrees of skill and education among the services for the medical positions involved. The physician assistant programs are extremely competitive, and only a small pool of military personnel would likely meet the requirements. Advocates noted that focusing this program on other medical staff, such as nurses, would face the same issues.

Commissioners noted that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) could set up its own medical school, much like the Army has to address similar transition problems. Staff noted that the VA has been resisting pressure growing within Congress to set up their own school and explained that the recommendation on the table originated with the VA itself. The amendment to strike this recommendation was adopted by voice vote. The overarching recommendation, which had been adopted, was revised to reflect this change.

Thereafter, the Commission discussed whether to take a position on the Commission on Care's recommendations for health care professionals. Some Commissioners had concerns about supporting such broad changes to personnel systems without first hearing from the VA or DoD and having a fulsome understanding of potential unintended consequences from those changes. The Commission noted the Commission on Care's diligent work in developing its recommendations and ultimately agreed not to make any changes to this recommendation from the Commission on Care.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended, and it was adopted by voice vote. The Commissioners agreed that the overarching recommendation is the only one that should remain in the Final Report, and the other language agreed upon should be moved to the implementation annex.

5. Proposal to Improve Personnel Systems for Federal cybersecurity, IT, and STEM professionals

At 1913 ET, Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included six recommendations to enable Federal agencies to compete effectively for talent and maintain a high-performing workforce in high-demand fields. Five amendments were discussed.

The first amendment would add an overarching recommendation that frames the other recommendations, as well as technical changes to make the presentation of recommendations consistent throughout. A Commissioner requested a revision to include the phrase to improve "the work environment within the Federal government so that it more effectively accommodates the needs of such employees". By voice vote, the Commission adopted the amendment with this revision.

The second amendment would strike a recommendation to establish mandatory technical skills standards for Federal IT employees and offer reskilling or transfer to a different occupational series for employees who do not meet such standards. Advocates for striking the section worried that this would decrease agency flexibility and that the concept of "mandatory technical skill standards" is not well understood. Staff pointed out that DoD has done this for financial positions, and that the CIO Council has this authority but has not used it. Similarly, agencies have the authority to retrain staff, but traditionally they have not done it. Advocates also

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

contended this issue would be better addressed in the narrative as a place where people need to use the authorities they have been given. The amendment to strike was adopted by voice vote.

The third amendment would strike language in a recommendation that requires investment in upgrading the skills of the existing Federal workforce, so that it does not request expanding a program that was recently authorized. Supporters of the amendment noted that the program only started in April of 2019, and that Congress needs time to see if the program accomplishes its goals. The Commissioners were generally supportive of describing the pilot in the narrative. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The fourth amendment would revise a recommendation holding agency heads responsible for using all available authorities to maintain an IT workforce, by explicitly tying this to the performance evaluations of CIOs and CHCOs. This amendment was intended to make the recommendation similar to an earlier recommendation about the performance evaluations of HR staff. Mr. Lekas noted that there would need to be conforming changes to the implementing language. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The fifth amendment would revise an amendment to establish agency work environments that support the needs of technical specialists. Proponents noted that this is a cultural change that requires leadership, and they offered to add language recommending that the President or OPM “issue a memorandum or guidance directing agency heads to take steps to establish work environments that support the needs of technical specialists in order to attract and retain their individuals with critical skillsets” Staff raised that agency heads have been resistant to these ideas, while some Commissioners contended that President action, through a memorandum or Executive Order, would like be ineffective. Proponents of this amendment also request cutting most of the implementing language. The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

An amendment to strike the entire proposal was withdrawn after the adoption of the above changes. Chairman Heck then reviewed which of the recommendation should be kept in the Final Report. Commissioners agree to keep four recommendations: to authorize broad adoption of the Cyber Talen Management System, to invest in upgrading the skills of the existing Federal workforce, to evaluate CIOs and CHCOs based on their ability to recruit and retain IT professionals, and to authorize OPM to pilot a new personnel system for STEM employees. The rest were either struck or moved to the implementation annex.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended, and it was adopted by voice vote.

6. Proposal to Establish a Civilian Reserve Model for Former Federal Cybersecurity Professional

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included a single recommendation to build the capacity of Federal agencies to respond to unexpected, urgent cybersecurity incidents.

The only amendment to be offered was to add a recommendation to authorize transitioning members of the military with the requisite qualifications to become members of this reserve force. The amendment was adopted by voice vote without debate.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended, and it was adopted by voice vote. Commissioners suggested tying this concept to other reserve concepts being promoted in the Final Report.

7. Proposal to Establish a Long-term Plan for a New Personnel System

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included four recommendations to develop evidence from incremental changes and demonstration projects, which can be used to design a new personnel system for Federal agency civil servants. Commissioners highlighted the opportunity for the Commission to use the narrative of the Final Report to address how better to link the three kinds of service. Two amendments were discussed.

The first amendment would add an overarching recommendation to frame the underlying recommendations and make technical changes for consistency. Commissioners requested that the term “talent management system” be used in the Final Report, and the recommendation was revised to read “*The Commission encourages the Congress to authorize and the President to implement a modern talent system across the Federal government.*” The amendment was adopted by voice vote.

The second amendment would strike a recommendation to encourage State, local, and Tribal governments to review and adjust their civil service personnel systems to better attract and retain the next generation of public services. Commissioners expressed concern about the vagueness of the recommendation and insufficiently developed implementation guidance. The amendment to strike was adopted by voice vote.

Chairman Heck then reviewed which of the recommendations should be a part of the Final Report, versus those moved to the implementation annex. The Commissioners agreed that they should all be in the Final Report, but reordered. Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended, and it was adopted by voice vote.

8. Proposal to Improve Support for Student and First-year Teachers

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included four recommendations to improve access to teaching professions and address the shortage of teachers at public schools.

First, the Commissioners discussed an amendment to add an overarching recommendation that frames the other recommendations, as well as technical changes to make the presentation of recommendations consistent throughout. A Commissioner suggested that the recommendation also include the text phrase “recognize and honor contributions.” By voice vote, the Commission adopted this amendment with the additional text.

Next, the Commissioners discussed requests made by several of them to strike either the entire proposal or several recommendations. Some Commissioners supported discussing the challenges facing teachers in the narrative of the civics section of the Final Report but were uncomfortable with the recommendations or focusing solely on one profession here. The Commissioners adopted by voice votes amendments to strike:

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- A recommendation to modify the TEACH Grant program, because it does not address problematic administration of the program by the Education Department;
- A recommendation to leverage DoD schools to help veterans enter the teaching profession, because a program already exists and non-military teachers are available for those jobs; and
- A recommendation to offer Federal matching funds to support stipends paid to student teachers, because it does not make sense on its own.

In the end, the only recommendation that remained was to honor the contributions of teachers, potentially through congressional resolution. The Commissioners asked staff to include this idea within the civic materials for the Final Report. It was thus tabled for inclusion in a later deliberation on the revised civic education proposals.

At 2010 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended, and it was adopted. The Commission then took a fifteen-minute break.

Lead Service Authority Proposal

After the Commission reconvened, Ms. Haines briefed her fellow Commissioners on a conversation she had with Jack Lew—a former Treasury Secretary, White House Chief of Staff, and Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)—about independent organizations within the Executive Office of the President (EOP) and based on that conversation she suggested the Commission consider recommending that the Lead Service Authority be authorized to:

- Develop, as ONDCP does, the service budget for OMB to present to the President for submission to Congress and then to monitor and report to OMB on spending against that budget, ensuring that such efforts are consistent with strategic guidance issued on service by the Lead Service Authority;
- Review and clear recruiting materials across all agencies to ensure there is consistency in emphasis and tone, as well as a unified strategy on service; and
- Initiate a public campaign on service, which is explicitly funded by Congress.

Mr. Lew had described various historical examples of White House offices and efforts to coordinate on service, describing how different authorities could grant the organization a degree of independence. He explained that despite having high-level individuals with personal relationships with the President, it can be extremely challenging to move forward programs focused on service or getting access to senior leaders. He suggested that cabinet rank would only help an EOP component head get into certain meetings they would otherwise not be invited to, but that it did not assure much more. Such a position may, however, have an impact on how the head of the Lead Service Authority is perceived by constituents outside of the White House.

Commissioners expressed a desire to include a budget authority along the lines of what is outlined above, as well as an annual report on the state of service. Commissioners discussed how the budget authority would work, coming up with the analogy of an auditor's certificate

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

without the power to impact any of the numbers or line items. It would be a shaming tool that would not delay the budget process.

Staff agreed to prepare a revised lead service authority proposal for Commission consideration, deliberation, and voting later in the week.

At 2100 ET, the Commissioners closed their deliberations for the day, with the plan to reconvene the next morning at 0800 ET.

July 18, 2019

Selective Service System Proposals

Proposal to Extend Registration to All Americans

At 0800 ET, the Chairman opened the session with a request to revisit the vote on SSS Proposal 14, to amend the MSSA to remove male-only registration. The Commission voted unanimously to re-open the vote. Commissioners noted that this is a critical decision that could prove the most important the Commission makes.

Chairman Heck then called for a revote on this proposal. The Commission adopted the recommendation to extend registration to all Americans by roll call vote, with eight in favor and three against.

Commissioners then shared further views regarding the issue of extending recommendations to all Americans. One Commissioner discussed the strong emotional reactions to the proposal based on personal memories from past military service, expressing a strong desire that the nation never again require a military draft. Other Commissioners spoke to their continuing opposition to the proposal based on the concept that women are physiologically different and should be treated differently as a result.

A request was again made that the Final Report reflect alternative views on this recommendation or allow opposing Commissioners to express their alternative views. Chairman Heck promised that the Commission would consider this topic before the end of the week, after all of the votes had been completed.

National Service Proposals

Proposal to Encourage Recruitment Across Different Service Streams

At 0830 ET, the Commission reconvened, with Dr. Davidson no longer participating by phone, and initiated a discussion on the cross-services recruitment proposal.

Commissioners discussed an amendment to a proposal to afford “Team Lead” status for former military members who then join AmeriCorps. The amendment would require military members to have “successfully completed” their military term of service to qualify for Team Lead status. John Lira, Team Lead for National Service, suggested using the Title 38 definition of veteran, which includes all conditions for discharge except dishonorable discharge, to accomplish this. A vote on the amendment was called, and the amendment passed by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Commissioners then discussed encouraging cross-service recruitment, rather than requiring it. The subproposals could be suggestions, instead of requirements. The Commissioners agreed to this change and the language was appropriately edited before the Commissioners.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

Proposal to Require Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) to Offer In-State Tuition to National Service Alumni

At 0842 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on the proposal to require IHEs to offer in-state tuition to national service alumni.

The Commissioners discussed an amendment to require states, rather than institutes of higher education, to offer in-state tuition to national service alumni. The issues discussed included:

- College stakeholders' view that state legislatures and governors would be better positioned than IHEs to take on this requirement because of their resources;
- How this proposal related to the Veterans Choice Act, which serves a larger population with more political capital; and
- The potential negative consequences to national service alumni if a state chose not to adopt the in-state tuition approach.

Chairman Heck tabled the first amendment and introduced an amendment to encourage CNCS to work with IHEs and governors' associations to offer in-state tuition rates, rather than requiring any action to be taken. Commissioners discussed whether other state associations should be added to the list but resolved that it could politically complicate this effort.

The amendment to change the proposal to encouraging this action, instead of requiring it, passed by voice vote. As a result, the first amendment, to require states to act instead of IHEs, was withdrawn.

Chairman Heck then called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

Proposal to Create a National Service Fellowship Program

At 0850 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on a fellowship-based model to supplement national service growth. The Commission first considered an amendment that would entirely restructure the versions of the proposals presented to the Commission. This restructured proposal would create a new marketplace for service by empowering individuals to find organizations to host national service opportunities. Commissioners raised the following key points in discussion of this proposal:

- Whether the proposal should focus on empowering youth or providing more opportunities;

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- Who should certify the program (the state commission or the host) and how certification would work;
- Other similar programs across the country;
- Reserving a percentage of seats for opportunity youth;
- The costs of all the options and the fact this would be in addition to AmeriCorps funding;
- Whether to start small, such as with only 5000 members, and then grow to include more individuals;
- Whether to divide individuals by Congressional district (such as 50 people per Congressional district to start and then grow to 500 people per district);
- The definition of “national service” and whether firefighting, as an example, would be considered volunteerism, community service, or national service;
- Whether members of Congress could nominate or choose individuals;
- Whether Congress would fund the program;
- Support for members to pursue their GED and if this incentive structure would work;
- the potential for abuse;
- Whether rural youth should be added as a special category;
- The role of the Lead Service Authority in integrating public service into this proposal; and
- How to ensure diverse experiences by reserving 20% of the positions for CNCS to place servicemembers anywhere in the country, rather than just within their district.

The Commissioners desired some of these issues to be discussed in the narrative, especially highlighting the focus on diversity as a goal of the fellowships.

At 1000 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the restructured amendment. The Commission adopted the restructured amendment by voice vote. As a result, three other Commissioners withdrew their competing amendments. There was a vote on the amended proposal, including the restructured amendment, which passed by voice vote. The Commission then took a 15-minute break.

Proposal to Increase the AmeriCorps Living Allowance

At 1015 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on increasing the AmeriCorps state and national living allowance. Commissioner Gearan was not present for the rest of the morning and Commissioner Wada missed the first 15 minutes of the following discussion.

The staff clarified that the current stipend was \$15,300, that many members were on food stamps, and that the stipend was taxed. An amendment to include cost-of-living adjustments was withdrawn because it was already in the proposal. An amendment to specify a number for the stipend was also withdrawn.

Commissioners then discussed how to increase the allowance and require both cost-of-living or inflation adjustments. The Commission considered whether:

- To apply a currently existing adjustment, such as the one for Federal employees;

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- An increased allowance would mean decreasing the number of service opportunities;
- This idea would be better presented in the narrative instead of the recommendation;
- CNCS should have the authority to decide the correct stipend amount;
- An increased allowance would give the impression of an employment wage rather than a service stipend; and
- A cost-of-living adjustment would be considered mandatory spending.

An amendment was offered to strike the proposal to eliminate the maximum stipend restrictions. Commissioners noted that CNCS is not near paying servicemembers the maximum. The amendment passed by voice vote.

Another amendment to peg the stipend to VISTA was discussed. Staff noted that nothing prohibits CNCS from increasing the payment right now, except for limited funding. This discussion led to a new Commissioner amendment to strike the original proposal and replace it with the following: *The Commission recommends that the President and Congress encourage CNCS and grantee organizations in the AmeriCorps State and National program exercise their full authorities to increase the living allowances for members and provide adequate cost of living and geographic adjustments to those living allowances, and that Congress appropriate such sums as are necessary.*

The Commissioners discussed whether this approach:

- Is responsive to the concerns the Commission heard on its listening tour from national service alumni;
- Would be well received by CNCS and other institutional stakeholders, such as state and local governments; and
- Would require accompanying draft appropriation language.

A vote was called on the amendment to strike and replace the original proposal. The amendment passed by voice vote. There was then a vote on the amended proposal, which also passed by voice vote.

Proposal to Create More Flexible Benefits Package for AmeriCorps Participants

At 1045 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on incorporating a more flexible benefits compensation model into AmeriCorps.

Commissioners first discussed an amendment to strike the proposal and replacing it with one that recommends the President direct CNCS to perform a study on restructuring benefits.

Commissioners noted that they did not feel they had sufficient information to explain exactly how to restructure benefits, and that more research was required. They also would like for informed stakeholders to have more of an opportunity to weigh in on these ideas.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amendment, which passed by voice vote. A second amendment, which was similar in nature, was withdrawn. Then Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal, which passed by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Proposal for National Service Pilot Programs

At 1050 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on requiring CNCS to launch pilot programs.

Commissioners first discussed an amendment to strike the requirement that CNCS launch pilot programs. While Commissioners expressed opposition to mandating that CNCS launch pilot programs they supported the idea of Congress appropriating more funds. In response to a question, staff clarified that CNCS has the authority to launch pilots right now but does not use it; in response, the Commissioners recommended highlighting CNCS's existing authority in the narrative.

As a result, the recommendation was revised to read: *Congress should appropriate sufficient funds to conduct five demonstration projects over a period of three years.* The Commissioners discussed focusing appropriations in specific areas and agreed to recommend prioritize the following two: the reintegration of ex-offenders and place-based models.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended, which was approved by voice vote. The amendments that had been offered prior to the meeting were withdrawn as now being moot or incorporated.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal, which passed by voice vote.

Civic Education and Service-Learning Proposals

At 1100 ET, Chairman Heck turned the Commissioners' attention to the revised civics materials that Mr. Lekas had prepared since the Monday evening discussion. Commissioner Gearan and Davidson were not present for this discussion.

The Commissioners discussed whether the recommendations needed an overarching statement with the overall amount requested for both civics education and service-learning programs. Concerns were raised about how best to present this to Congress, including:

- Which funds would be distributed by CNCS and which by the Education Department;
- Where teacher professional development should be addressed; and
- Whether there should be 2 funds or 1 fund.

Commissioners agreed that the recommendations concerning civic education and service learning should be led by an overarching statement stating: *The Commission recommends the Congress appropriate \$450 million for civic education and service learning.*

Commissioners then turned their attention the appendices of best practices to support the overarching civic education recommendations. The following suggestions were offered and agreed to:

- The best practices for civic education and service learning should both include a recommendation that high school counselors are encouraged to help people think about how they can serve; and

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- The recommendation need not include pre-kindergarten since it does not match the civics education proposals found in the literature.

Mr. Lekas requested that Commissioners send him additional feedback via email. At 1125 ET, the Commissioners dispersed for lunch.

National Service Proposals – New Proposals

At 1230 ET, the Commission reconvened to discuss two proposals in the national service area, which were not presented in the binder materials. Chairman Gearan was absent for these discussions.

Proposal to Improve Flexibility for NCCC Participation

Commissioners considered a proposal to remove the 180-day limit on NCCC program participation or otherwise provide flexibility for NCCC participants to remain during the duration of a disaster or emergency. The following points were made:

- NCCC and FEMA have specifically sought this change to provide program flexibility, with the NCCC Director and FEMA agency contact noting to Commission staff their view that a class working on a disaster should be allowed to extend and continue working to minimize the disruption;
- The proposal would apply to NCCC programs overall and would not be limited to disaster response work, even if the impetus is to provide flexibility during disaster response scenarios;
- While this proposal would serve the benefit of continuity, it has a potential downside of decreasing access by delaying the start date for the next round of NCCC participants; and
- If adopted, the Commission should note the costs and trade-offs in the Final Report narrative.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal. The Commission adopted this proposal by voice vote.

Proposal to Fully Fund the Serve America Act

The Commission considered a proposal to fully fund the Serve America Act, Pub. L. 111-13. The Serve America Act became law in 2009 but was never fully funded. Specifically, the Commission considered whether to recommend that Congress fully fund an increase in the number of AmeriCorps members over the course of several years to 125,000 by 2021, 175,000 in 2022, and 250,000 in 2023. These levels are set out in the Serve America Act, and the proposal considered by the Commissioners would merely replace the years in the Serve America Act to reflect the passage of time.

Commissioners discussed the risk that focusing on funding the Serve America Act could detract emphasis from the Commission's other proposals. Commissioners also noted that the Serve

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

America Act already has support and may have less need for this Commission's endorsement than some of the Commission's new proposals.

A suggestion was made that the issue of fully funding the Serve America Act would be better addressed in the narrative of the Final Report, instead of as one of the recommendations. It could then be framed as part of a broader problem of Congress authorizing great ideas and then not fully funding them. This suggestion was accepted by the Commissioners, and the initial proposal a specific increase in AmeriCorps as set out in the Serve America Act was withdrawn.

National Service Proposals – Bundled Proposals

At 1250 ET, Chairman Heck turned the discussion to a series of national service proposals originally presented as part of a consolidated bundle. There were twelve distinct proposals discussed during this session. All Commissioners, except for Dr. Davidson, were present for the discussion and voting.

1. Proposal to Improve Messaging and Branding of National Service

Chairman Heck introduced the proposal, which included three discrete recommendations designed to increase public awareness of national service opportunities. The Commission discussed these as well as six amendments to the proposal.

The first amendment would strike a recommendation for the President direct CNCS and Peace Corps to create a definition of national service, and replace it with one where Congress directs the Lead Service Agency to oversee this effort. Commissioners noted the following:

- Branding is an issue because military, national, and public service communities brand service differently, and the Commission's goal should be to figure out how to make the word service *mean* military, national and public service;
- National service is the most misunderstood and unknown of the three service areas; and
- Only defining national service may continue the problem of keeping the three service areas siloed instead of connected.

The Commission voted on and adopted this amendment by voice vote. As a result, an amendment originally proposed to revise the underlying recommendation was withdrawn.

The second amendment would acknowledge concerns raised by the CNCS Inspector General (IG) including concerns about financial management problems that CNCS has faced. Commissioners noted:

- In connection with CNCS' 2017 and 2018 financial audits, the IG determined that it could not make an assessment of CNCS because their financial records were not clear enough;
- CNCS CEO Barbara Stewart has, in her short time at CNCS, put into action both a "get well" plan and a transformation plan, which will require a significant commitment for CNCS to see through;

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- The Hill is aware of existing problems at CNCS and they will impact Members' support for the Commission's national service recommendations;
- The Commission's strategy for messaging must account for congressional resistance to increasing the size and scope of CNCS programs, and the Commission should be prepared to pre-emptively address these issues with Congress;
- The Commission may convey that it is aware of the existing concerns and would like to see if CNCS's efforts will make it better; and
- There may be a role for the Lead Service Agency to support CNCS or provide some oversight.

The Commissioners unanimously agreed that the audit issues should be discussed in the narrative of the Final Report. The amendment as originally proposed was withdrawn and not adopted as a formal recommendation.

The third, fourth, and fifth amendments would revise a recommendation that OMB issue a memo requiring all federal agency websites to include links to CNCS and Peace Corps. The amendments would:

- Limit this requirement to appropriate federal agency websites, as determined by OMB or the Lead Service Agency;
- Review military service websites as potential links for websites, in addition to the other two; and
- Move the revised recommendation into the implementation section of the Final Report.

The Commission adopted all three amendments by voice vote.

The sixth amendment would add senior citizens and grandparents to the list of "key influencers" for purpose of focusing public awareness campaigns. It was noted that grandparents are stepping into the role of parents in many communities, and Senior Corps is well-connected to youth. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

2.Proposal to Optimize Cross-Service Marketing and Recruitment Opportunities

Chairman Heck introduced the proposal, which offered three recommendations to form collaborative and mutually beneficial marketing and referral relationships among service agencies. The discussion included eight amendments to the original three recommendations.

The first amendment would relocate the recommendation for DoD to work with national and public service actors to the military service part of the Final Report. The Commissioners adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The second amendment would make the Lead Service Agency the entity responsible for an interagency working group focused on facilitating cross-service efforts on recruitment, retention

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

and benefits. All Commissioners agreed to the broader focus and to move this recommendation into the Lead Service Agency proposal.

The third amendment would recommend that Congress, through the NDAA, require DoD, in consultation with CNCS and the Peace Corps, to develop and provide to the SASC and HASC a plan for sharing ineligible or non-selected applicants with information about the other forms of service. The following issues were discussed:

- Whether the Committees' attention is helpful because it allows them to maintain pressure on issues of diverse recruiting, or whether it is harmful because they will focus on making mission numbers;
- Whether military leadership will support this effort; and
- Whether a working group or DoD should take on the lead role in preparing the contemplated report.

The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The fourth and fifth amendments would include information on national service to assist folks transitioning out of the military as well as to share information about military and public service with those transitioning out of national service. Commissioners noted they want the narrative of the report to address equitable sharing of opportunities, instead of how those who cannot meet the military standards can use national service as a fall back. The Commission adopted both amendments by voice vote.

The sixth amendment would make the President, instead of Congress, the actor for revising the proposed program for transitioning service members. Once it was clarified that the current transitioning program (TAP) is established in statute, the amendment was withdrawn.

The seventh amendment would amend 10 USC 503 to allow DoD to share student directory information with other agencies beside JAMRS. Commissioners raised concerns about privacy and whether the proposal would undermine some recruiting efforts. In the end, the amendment was withdrawn.

The eighth amendment would recommend that Congress appropriate the necessary funds for joint marketing efforts. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote. For purposes of the Final Report, the Commissioners suggested creating a cross-service section of the report, which may include discussion of these recommendations.

3. Proposal to Empower CNCS to Collect more Complete Member Data

Chairman Heck introduced the next proposal, which included two recommendations to enhance data collection of national service members to improve policies to promote these programs. Four amendments were discussed.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The first amendment would simplify the first recommendation to recommend that the President direct CNCS to collect data and report it to the Lead Service Authority. This amendment would remove congressional action from the recommendation, because CNCS already has all of the authority it needed. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The second amendment would strike the second recommendation and move into the narrative the concern that CNCS does not collect sufficient information from its departing members. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

The third amendment would provide CNCS the authority to accept in-kind donations for housing. It was withdrawn after Mr. Lekas explained that in-kind donations are permitted under current law.

The fourth amendment would have the Lead Service Authority, at the completion of national service, issue each “graduate” a DD-214-like form to give proof of service and eligibility for benefits. In the future, the form could be used to qualify for other benefits, such as state license discounts or NCE. The Commissioners discussed whether the SF-50 was a similar tool for Federal employees. The Commission adopted this amendment by voice vote.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

4. Proposal to Increase flexibility in the AmeriCorps Child Care Allowance

Chairman Heck introduced the next proposal, which had a single recommendation to restructure the AmeriCorps childcare allowance. Commissioners offered three amendments. One amendment reframed the recommendation as a direction to CNCS to ease restrictions rather than dictating to CNCS how the program should be changed. The Commission adopted the amendment and the two other amendments were withdrawn as a result.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal by voice vote.

5. Proposal to Improve the Value and Usability of the Segal AmeriCorps Education Award

Chairman Heck introduced a discussion on the next proposal, which included five recommendations to provide AmeriCorps alumni additional and more effective options to apply their Segal award.

Prior to discussion, Chairman Heck shared fiscal analysis performed by the staff, demonstrating an estimated cost of \$213 million over ten years if the Segal award were made non-taxable.

The first amendment would clarify that the Segal award should cover the national average cost for one year at a public university. Commissioners asked that the Final Report make it clear that the Segal award is being de-linked from the Pell grant, which is indexed but too low, in an attempt to increase its value and enable a year of college. The amendment was approved by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The second amendment was to strike the last recommendation in its entirety. After the staff explained that the VISTA program had previously been left out and the recommendation would expand to cover all AmeriCorps alumni, the amendment was withdrawn.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

6. Proposal to Expand national service incentives through Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included three recommendations to call on IHEs to show their support for national service. Three amendments were discussed.

The first amendment would strike any reference to match funding. Commissioners discussed the financial strain facing many IHEs. The Commission voted in favor of striking the reference to match funding.

The second amendment would change an “and” to an “or” in the first recommendation, which converted an inclusive list to a list of options for incentivizing national service alum. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

The third amendment would strike the third recommendation, which would increase the number of Campuses of Service that CNCS should recognize under an existing program. Commissioners noted that CNCS, to date, has failed to recognize any IHE as a Campus of Service and rather than endorse a specific target for the program, the Commission could discuss the program in the narrative. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the proposal as amended. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

7. Proposal to Restructure the Senior Corps Program

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included three recommendations to help Senior Corps leaders and program sponsors to expand programming and attract volunteers.

The Commission considered one amendment to direct the third recommendation to the President and Congress rather than to CNCS program offices. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

8. Proposal to Invest in Programs that Engage Diverse and Underserved Populations in National Service

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included two recommendations to ensure continued investment in programs. Two amendments were discussed.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The first amendment would provide a detailed goal of doubling the number of opportunities by 2032, to include highlighting opportunities for tribal youth. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

The second amendment would recommend the President to direct CNCS to include opportunities for intellectually diverse or developmental disabilities. “Intellectually diverse” relates to autism spectrum and other developmental issues that do not constitute disabilities. The Commissioners debated whether this would require a statutory change and determined it would not. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

9. Proposal to Leverage National Service Programming to Support the Reintegration of Ex-Offenders

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included three recommendations that would require CNCS to prioritize grant funding and member support to programs that offer services to and opportunities for ex-offenders. The Commissioners started by noting that this proposal has the potential to get the attention of popular figures, such as Kim Kardashian, who have focused on these issues in the past.

The first amendment would revise the phrasing of the second recommendation and delete an example that was included. The Commission voted to adopt this amendment.

The second amendment would add a recommendation encouraging CNCS to study best practices for reintegration. The Commissioners discussed:

- CNCS’s previous efforts to work in this space;
- The messaging challenge of describing this as a reintegration tool, and not suggesting that service should replace a criminal sentence or other punishment; and
- The necessity of elevating reintegration of ex-offenders to the “focus area” level, which is dictated by statute.

As a result, the amendment was revised to strike the third recommendation and replace the first recommendation with a new proposal to recommend the President to direct CNCS to explore this issue as a grant priority and study best practices. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

10. Proposal to Expand National Service Opportunities through Private Sector Engagement

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included two recommendations to encourage private sector corporations to support service organizations. Two amendments were discussed.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The first amendment would move the current recommendations to an appendix rather than the body of the Final Report and replace them with an overarching statement by the Commission recognizing the role of the private sector to support service opportunities. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

The second amendment would strike the term “corporate social responsibility,” which is not well defined and evokes a political activism perspective. As an alternative, the Commission could use the phrase “corporate commitment to service” and highlight in the narrative the business benefits of these approaches. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

11. Proposal to Expand National Service through Government Partnerships

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included six recommendations to provide private sector companies and government agencies at all levels with best practices for promoting national service.

The Commissioners started with a discussion of four amendments, each of which the Commission adopted. The amendments:

- Focused the first recommendation specifically on state and local leaders;
- Revised the second recommendation to require federal agencies to assess the feasibility of creating a federal service corps, instead of having Congress direct coordination amongst various offices;
- Struck the third recommendation to avoid reopening the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA); and
- Removed the sixth recommendation, with an understanding that the text of the final Report could address how using grants to match funds would improve national service opportunities.

The Commissioners then held a broader discussion of whether this proposal should be addressed in a cross-services section of the Final Report or whether it would be better raised in an appendix rather than in the text of the Final Report. Commissioners raised concerns about the detail in this set of recommendations and how they could be viewed as an unnecessary expansion of government programs. Commissioners supported a recommendation that these non-Federal entities focus on supporting national service programs. As a result, an amendment was offered to strike the proposal and instead incorporate relevant points into the narrative. The proposal with this amendment was then put to a vote. The Commissioners adopted by voice vote the proposal, including a decision to highlight good practices the Commission has observed in the narrative of the Final Report.

12. Proposal to Expand National Service through New Service Models

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included two recommendations to build alternative models of service. One amendment was offered, which would add exploring the value of “virtual service opportunities” as part of the Peace Corps Response Volunteers, instead of requiring an expansion of the program. The Commission voted in favor of this amendment.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

At 1630 ET, the Commissioners dispersed for dinner.

Military Service Proposals

Proposal on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery Test (the ASVAB)

At 1830 ET, the Commission reconvened with all Commissioners present; Dr. Davidson joined by phone. Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on a proposal to develop the ASVAB to increase administration of the exam and increase exposure to military service. Specifically, the proposal contained three recommendations, which focused on encouraging states to mandate ASVAB administration in schools, giving DoD statutory authority for partnerships with IHEs to promote the adoption of ASVAB as an assessment tool, and recommending that DoD rename the test and request input from CNCS and Peace Corps.

Commissioners identified three reasons supporting an increase administration of the ASVAB: (1) it can help to identify strengths; (2) it can increase awareness of military opportunities; and (3) it can serve as a useful counseling tool, especially if people understand how to apply its results to a wider set of opportunities. Commissioners generally agreed that the ASVAB could be a useful resource across all forms of service and the government should try to increase the number of individuals taking the test.

However, Commissioners raised major concerns with modifying the current ASVAB—a validated test relied on by DoD—based on input from organizations that do not understand the test or have the same needs as DoD. Commissioners highlighted the following points:

- Changing the current content of the ASVAB would likely weaken the test and lead to DoD opposition;
- Organizations, such as CNCS and OPM, need better education on what the test is and consider whether they can utilize the current scores;
- CNCS, OPM, and Peace Corps would be more receptive to using the test if they felt like there was a possibility for them to have input on its content;
- A current weakness of the ASVAB CEP is that it does not test for soft skills, such as empathy or leadership; and
- The costs of the test are currently borne by DoD, which has previously supported increased administration of the test because it can lead to recruitment leads.

The Commissioners also discussed how families will respond to this proposal, noting:

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

- Mandating the test may interfere with parenting choices and will likely meet the same general opposition to adding required tests;
- Maintaining the current options individuals' have to protect or share their scores is essential to ensure the public will accept the test;
- Branding and marketing of the test needs to change, so that people do not assume taking the tests means you will get calls from recruiters; and
- Changing the public's understanding of how the test will be used also requires reaching out to career counselors and influencers.

Two amendments were offered, which would replace the original three recommendations with the following:

- *Recommend the President direct the DoD, OPM, and CNCS to evaluate the potential applicability of the ASVAB CEP program to national service and federal public service.*
- *Encourages the President and the State to promote ASVAB administration in schools.*

These two additions, along with the suggestion to strike the original recommendations were voted on together. The Commission voted in favor of these changes.

An amendment was offered to require anyone applying for Federal student loans to take the ASVAB. The Commissioners agreed that this concept would be better placed in the narrative of the Final Report, as a carefully crafted suggestion that people should take advantage of the tool before making career and education decisions, such as taking out loans. As a result, the amendment was withdrawn.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the proposal by voice vote.

Proposal to Create New Education Pipelines for Enlisted Servicemembers

At 1920 ET, Chairman Heck initiated a discussion on a proposal to improve enlisted education support through two recommendations which would fund limited tuition grants in exchange for service commitments and create a pilot program to facilitate certificates in technical programs.

Commissioners offered three amendments:

- A request to describe good models in the narrative, such as the work the Army has done, including on how to handle for-profit education companies;
- An option that grant participants who cannot meet the standards, can either repay or serve in a national service program, so that the government does not lose the investment and people can serve elsewhere; and
- An edit to just use the term partnerships, to avoid confusion when both entities involved are public organizations.

The Commission voted in favor of the three amendments.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

The Commissioners also discussed an amendment to expand the proposal to include CNCS or the Federal government. Several expressed a desire to focus specifically on the military's needs and noted that the programs may be difficult to extend to public and national service organizations since they are differently situated. For example, they would have many fewer people who would likely participate, they do not have a structure like an enlistment agreement to facilitate this program, and the congressional committees that authorize those programs may have less of an appetite for this kind of investment. In the end, the Commissioners agreed that the narrative for this proposal should suggest that the Administration look for ways to replicate this concept in the public service and national service sectors.

Chairman Heck called for a vote on the amended proposal. The Commission adopted the amended proposal by voice vote.

Military Service Proposals – Bundled Proposals

At 1945 ET, Chairman Heck turned the discussion to a series of military service proposals originally presented as part of a consolidated bundle. There were seven distinct proposals discussed during this session. All Commissioners participated in the discussion and Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included five recommendations to expand the Cyber Leadership Development Program (CLDP) and Cyber Institutes. Two amendments were discussed for this proposal.

1. Proposal to Expand Pipeline of Digital Talent

An amendment was offered to revise the fourth recommendation, relating to Cyber Institutes, to not specify that funding should be provided. Commissioners objected, noting that the program is currently an unappropriated authorization and it is directly connected to the Commission's mandate. The Commission rejected the amendment by voice vote.

The second amendment was to revise the last recommendation to ensure that tuition assistance is offered in a consistent manner. The Commission adopted the amendment by voice vote.

2. Proposal to Improve Retention of Cyber Talent

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included four recommendations to collect information on the use of special HR authorities and the reasons for departing digital talent. Two changes were agreed to by Commissioners to clarify the current recommendations, which would make it clear when the proposals are focused on cyber talent versus required for all personnel, and whether the reports are being sent to Congress by DoD.

An amendment was offered to add a new recommendation that would encourage all agencies to provide incentives to mid or senior-level leadership, to agree that they can be called back on a part-time basis when facing a crisis. It was noted that a major challenge for agencies is losing experts to the private sector for higher wages, despite the desire of these individuals to continue to serve in some way. Commissioners recognized that this relates to the critical skills IRR previously discussed. The Commission adopted the amendment by voice vote.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

3. Proposal to Enhance Advertising and Marketing for Military Service

Chairman Heck turned to the next proposal, which had a single recommendation to appropriate multiple-year funding for military marketing and advertising. Amendments for two new recommendations were offered. The first would require DoD to review its advertising efforts and consider how best to align with current information consumption platforms. The Commissioners adjusted some of the language about which organizations should be consulted by DoD during this review. The second new recommendation would recommend that Congress and local leaders use their office to encourage youth to consider military opportunities. It would make congressional members an extension of the recruiting force. The Commission adopted the amendments by voice vote.

4. Proposal to Increase Opportunities for Youth Exploration

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included three recommendations to expand JROTC programs, strengthen cadet programs, and increase the number of base visits. There were four amendments and three new recommendations offered for this proposal, all of which were adopted unanimously.

Three of the amendments resulted in little discussion before their adoption. They were:

- to add exposure to national and public service opportunities as part of the JROTC curriculum;
- to expand base access by having reviews of security restrictions; and
- to encourage bases to open up to other youth programs, besides JROTC.

The fourth amendment was to revise the first recommendation and make it clear that there should be at minimum 3700 JROTC programs, a number that was set out by Congress in 2007. The Commissioners debated whether:

- this was the right goal for the current environment, given that there were 3400 programs in 2016;
- there should be a basis of distribution based on population, making the placement more equitable without risking current programs;
- the cost of approximately \$100,000 per school per year and \$670 per cadet is justifiable.

In the end, the Commissioners proposed a goal of 6000 JROTC programs by 2032, tying it to the moonshot proposals. The amendment was put to a vote and unanimously approved.

The first new idea was to encourage DoD to increase outreach to the community, with a focus on the diverse career options available in the military. The Commissioners approved this addition, as long as it was stripped of the various examples initially included, such as requiring participation in career fairs.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL

The second new idea was to encourage DoD to partner with community groups on service-learning experiences. Commissioners wanted to specifically highlight the work already being done in cadet corps, Starbase, and Youth ChalleNGe.

The final new idea was to encourage state and local leaders to look at JROTC-like programs, to gain a sense of how best practices in those programs can improve discipline and academic focus. Commissioners wanted to ensure that these programs remained independent from DoD, in part to avoid suggestions that they are engaged in recruiting children.

5. Proposal to Increase Engagements in Areas with Low Rates of Propensity

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included three recommendations to increase awareness and aspiration in low-propensity areas of the country. One amendment and four new recommendations were offered, and all were adopted unanimously.

The amendment was to greatly revise the first recommendation so as to establish a pilot program overseen by the Lead Service Agency, previously discussed by the Commission. The pilot program would focus on investing marketing resources into underrepresented populations across military, national, and public service options.

The first new idea derived from a desire to explicitly state in the Final Report that schools should not block DoD access to schools. Commissioners offered some edits, primarily to move the responsibility for this message to the President and Governors, and away from Congress.

The second new idea was to promote having the National Guard and the Reserve Forces reach out to their communities. Commissioners noted that this is already being done some places, and those organizations have a small number of full-time staff. Based on Dr. Rough's question whether this task would be simply permitted for reserve and guard members, or whether it would be mandated, the recommendation was further edited.

The third new idea calls on Congress to extend temporary authority to develop recruiting incentives that are targeted at areas with lower rates of propensity. Commissioners clarified that the Services currently have this authority, but they need to utilize it more.

The final new idea was for the Services to develop pilot programs that use Guard and Reserve units to partner with schools. Commissioners noted that the Guard units frequently partner with foreign services but have fewer partnerships with local groups.

6. Proposal to Increase Personnel Management Flexibility

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included one recommendation to encourage the Services to use the personnel management authorities to foster permeability between all components of military service, as well as between the military and the private sector.

The Commissioners offered amendments to expand these ideas to public service and to force DoD to use the authorities that they have, especially when it comes to revising warrant officer positions for more technical skills, such as cyber. These proposals were unanimously supported,

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

although the expansion to other service branches was moved to the cross-services section of the Final Report.

7. Proposal to Address Youth Eligibility

Chairman Heck began a discussion on the next proposal, which included two recommendations to invest in the health and well-being of American youth and consider revising current eligibility standards and incentive structures.

The Commissioners had a robust debate about the appropriateness of commenting on current military standards. Some Commissioners wanted to explicitly address the large percentage of American youth who do not meet the standards and describe this as a national security problem that requires immediate action. They argued that failing to mention it would discredit the report. Two different approaches were raised to potentially address the problem:

- calling for another Commission to study ways to improve youth health; and
- requiring DoD to reconsider their standards—such as for marijuana use, tattoos, and beards—that are out of sync with current social norms.

Some Commissioners argued that the Services do regularly review the standards, with the Army completing a review two years ago, and several of the issues above were considered and addressed. Services have decreased requirements surrounding beards and tattoos. These Commissioners supported discussing standard concerns in the narrative, by highlighting that the Services are doing what they can and more work needs to be done. While addressing the root cause of why young people can't meet these standards is the right idea, it also seems to fall outside the Commission's mandate.

Additional points were made related to the inconsistent and problematic ways that the waiver process is managed, and the need for the Services to better educate the public about the standards.

An amendment to strike the recommendation failed by a vote of 3-8. An amendment to require a holistic review of the eligibility standards was adopted, as well as a new recommendation for DoD to widely disseminate updated information on eligibility standards, were passed by a vote of 8-3.

Final Votes on the Bundle Proposals

At 2120 ET, Chairman Heck called for a vote on the bundled proposals. Two Commissioners requested that the last proposal be voted on separately.

The first six bundled proposals were adopted by voice vote of the Commission.

Chairman Heck then called for a vote on proposal 7 within the military service bundle. It failed by a vote of 7-4. The Commission agreed that the topic of standards and eligibility could be mentioned in the narrative of the Final Report even though the Commission would not adopt a proposal to address standards and eligibility as a formal recommendation.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Closing Deliberations

Chairman Heck raised three outstanding issues for consideration by the Commission.

First, the Commission considered an updated proposal for civic education and service learning. The Commission adopted the recommendations contained in the updated proposal by voice vote. Mr. Lekas noted that staff would welcome any further clarifications and technical edits from Commissioners as staff develops the proposal into the Final Report and legislation.

Second, the Commission considered an updated proposal to create a Lead Service Authority. The Commission adopted updated proposal by voice vote. Mr. Lekas indicated that staff would develop further detail on concrete functions for the Lead Service Authority based on other recommendations adopted by the Commission and would present those to the Commission at the September meeting.

Third, the Commission considered whether to allow additional views in the Final Report, specifically on the proposal to extend SSS registration to all Americans. The Commission unanimously agreed to permit additional views in the Final Report, with the scope and format of additional views to be determined. Dr. Rough asked any Commissioners planning to prepare these views to reach out to her so that the staff would be appropriately prepared to include them in the Report.

Before concluding the July meeting, Commissioners provided additional guidance to staff. First, they noted that the “Service Registration System” will require a new name, and indicated their availability to discuss options. Second, they noted that while the Commission has concluded its votes and endorsement of recommendation language, staff may use its discretion to determine the appropriate placement and ordering of the language in the Final Report. Finally, they noted that the Final Report need not follow the order of Commission votes and that recommendations need not be grouped in the same manner as for the voting sessions.

At 2130, the Commissioners closed their deliberations and Chairman Heck concluded the July meeting.

Prepared by Paul Lekas, General Counsel

Adopted by the Commission on October 16, 2019.