



NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE

Minutes of May 2019 Commission Meeting

The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (the Commission) held a meeting on May 15-17, 2019, in Arlington, VA. Portions of this meeting concerned organizational and other pre-decisional and deliberative matters and were closed to the public pursuant to Public Law 114-328, section 554(b)(3). The Commissioners agreed to make a separate version of these minutes available to the public.

Attendance

Commissioners present:

- Mr. Edward Allard
- Mr. Steve Barney
- The Honorable Mark Gearan (serving as Acting Chair on 5/15 and 5/17)
- The Honorable Avril Haines (except morning of 5/15)
- Ms. Jeanette James
- Mr. Alan Khazei
- Mr. Thomas Kilgannon
- Ms. Shawn Skelly
- The Honorable Debra Wada (serving as Acting Chair on 5/16)

Commissioners absent:

- The Honorable Dr. Janine Davidson
- The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck

Staff present:

- Kent Abernathy, Executive Director
- Paul Lekas, General Counsel
- Jill Rough, Director of Research and Analysis
- Keri Lowry, Director of Government Affairs and Public Engagement
- Peter Morgan, Director of Operations
- Other Commission staff

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

May 15, 2019

Business Meeting

The Commission convened in a conference room at the Partnership for Public Service in Washington, D.C., shortly after 0805 ET. All Commissioners were present, except for Chairman Heck, Dr. Davidson, and Ms. Haines. Prior to the meeting, Chairman Heck had appointed Vice Chair Gearan and Vice Chair Wada to serve as Acting Chair. Acting Chair Gearan moved to close this and other business meetings to occur on May 15-17, 2019, because pre-decisional and organizational matters would be deliberated. A motion was made and seconded, and all Commissioners present agreed.

Acting Chair Gearan moved to approve minutes from the April 2019 Commission meeting. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the April 2019 minutes with minor clarifications and technical edits.

Kent Abernathy, Executive Director, reviewed the agenda for the May meeting. He then provided an overview of the agenda for the June meeting and discussed preparations for voting in July. He explained that Commissioners would receive a first set of voting material at the June meeting and the second set of materials would be sent to each Commissioner on July 3. He noted that staff would provide preliminary voting material ahead of these dates to familiarize Commissioners with the open proposals. Paul Lekas, General Counsel, noted that there would be a process for Commissioners to propose amendments to any of the voting proposals. Mr. Khazei recommended that the Commission agree on overarching objectives and the “moonshot” before voting on individual proposals. Mr. Lekas said the June meeting would include a session dedicated to this topic and the goal is for the Commission to agree on a moonshot ahead of the July voting period.

Brian Collins, Team Lead for Public Service, then briefed the Commission on the day’s public hearings. He provided background on the panelists, the issues likely to arise, and the key questions for Commissioners to explore with the panelists. As an overarching goal for the hearings, Mr. Collins recommended exploring disagreement among the panelists on challenging issues, such as reforming the competitive examination process, the overall narrative on public service employees, and veterans’ preference. The Commission then discussed its role in addressing these topics. Vice Chair Wada recommended that the Commission focus on its role as an influencer and cautioned against organizations viewing the Commission as a “savior” that would solve issues that have persisted for decades. Keri Lowry, Director of Government Affairs and Public Engagement, said that organizations in this space view the Commission as an influencer, not a panacea.

Ms. James requested that staff prepare a primer on the major federal personnel reform efforts undertaken in the 1990s, which she described as the last major attempt to reform the federal civilian service. Acting Chair Gearan recommended speaking with Elaine Kaymarck at Brookings about this effort. Mr. Collins agreed to explore the effort and generate a primer. Relatedly, Ms. Skelly talked about an event she attended recently at the Partnership for Public

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

Service. Participants felt that marginal changes to the federal civilian service system would be insufficient and they recommended significant reforms to address problems with the system.

Mr. Collins then responded to questions about the position of federal labor unions. He said they have concerns with changes, such as those at the Department of Veterans Affairs, that have made it easier to fire people. They also have concerns about efforts to undermine collective bargaining and proposals that affect the rights or benefits of members.

The session concluded at 0850 ET.

Public Hearing: Improving Basic Hiring Processes

From 0900 to 1200 ET, Commissioners held a public hearing titled “Improving Basic Hiring Processes.” Testifying as part of this hearing were Melissa Bryant, the Chief Policy Officer of Iraq & Afghanistan Veterans of America; Kimberly Holden, the Deputy Associate Director of Employee Services, Talent Acquisition and Workforce Shaping at the Office of Personnel Management; Brett Hunt, the Executive Director of the Public Service Academy at Arizona State University; Jacqueline Simon, the Public Policy Director of the American Federation of Government Employees; and Max Stier, the President and CEO of Partnership for Public Service. A live stream of the hearing was made available on the Commission’s Facebook and YouTube pages.

Public Hearing: Critical Skills and Benefits

From 1300 to 1600 ET, Commissioners held a public hearing titled “Critical Skills and Benefits.” Testifying as part of this hearing were Terry Gerton, the President and CEO of the National Academy of Public Administration; Eddie Hartwig, the Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Digital Service; Travis Hoadley, a Senior Advisor to the Chief Human Capital Officer at the Department of Homeland Security; Jessie Klement, the Staff Vice President of Advocacy of the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association; and Elizabeth Kolmstetter, the Director of Talent Strategy and Engagement of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. A live stream of the hearing was made available on the Commission’s Facebook and YouTube pages. Ms. Haines joined the Commissioners for this hearing.

May 16, 2019

Business Meeting

The Commission convened at the Partnership for Public Service in Washington, DC, at 0820 ET with Vice Chair Wada presiding as Acting Chair. All Commissioners were present, except for Chairman Heck and Dr. Davidson.

Amy Schafer, Team Lead for Military Service, briefed the Commission on the day’s public hearings. She provided background on the panelists, the issues likely to arise, and the key questions for Commissioners to explore with the panelists. Ms. Schafer stated that the overarching goals for the hearings were to collect ideas on how to identify critical skills, lessen the civil-military divide, and attract young people to the military. The meeting ended at 0835 ET.

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

Public Hearing: Continuum of Service: Fostering Critical Skills and Creating new pipelines

From 0900 to 1200 ET, Commissioners held a public hearing titled “Continuum of Service: Fostering Critical Skills and Creating New Pipelines.” Testifying as part of this hearing were Nicole Camarillo, the Executive Director of Talent Acquisition and Management Strategy for the U.S. Army Cyber Command; Dr. David Chu, the President of the Institute for Defense Analyses; Dr. Sharon Hamilton, the Director of Liaison and Military Operations of the Institute for Leadership and Strategic Studies at the University of North Georgia; Katherine Kidder, a Political Scientist at RAND; and Raj Shah, the Co-Founder of Arceo.ai. A live stream of the hearing was made available on the Commission’s Facebook and YouTube pages.

Public Hearing: Increasing Awareness Among Young Americans & Lessening the Civil-Military Divide

From 1300 to 1600 ET, Commissioners held a public hearing titled “Increasing Awareness Among Young Americans & Lessening the Civil-Military Divide.” Testifying as part of this hearing were CJ Chivers, an author and journalist with the *New York Times*; Dr. Lindsay Cohn, a Professor at the U.S. Naval War College; Ernie Gonzales, the former Director of Youth Outreach Programs for the DoD Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; Dr. Kathleen Hicks, the Senior Vice President and Director of the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; and Mr. Anthony Kurta, performing the duties of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness at DoD. A live stream of the hearing was made available on the Commission’s Facebook and YouTube pages.

May 17, 2019

Business Meeting

The Commission reconvened at 0800 for a quick review of the June schedule. All Commissioners were present, except for Chairman Heck and Dr. Davidson.

Public Hearing Debrief: Public Service

The Commission then moved to a deliberation regarding the first day’s hearings on public service. All Commissioners, except for Chairman Heck and Dr. Davidson, participated in the meeting.

Ms. Haines said that the afternoon panel appeared to uniformly support a talent management system. She noted that despite the benefits of such a system, it would not be a cure-all, citing ineffective leadership as one example. Mr. Barney also took away from the hearings an overall sense of the need to move toward a talent management system for public service.

Vice Chair Wada was concerned on how to support both employee-side talent management and institutional needs. She found the positive reference to the military’s talent management ironic because the Army has acknowledged its deficiencies in this area. Ms. James felt that the Air Force has managed talent better than other services because as a more technical group it has

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

adopted certain private sector practices. Vice Chair Wada suggested that this system is only for pilots and Ms. James clarified that certain other classes of personnel fall within the system. Ms. Skelly seemed to agree, noting that she was shocked when she learned that the pilots in the Air Force were made aware of the open positions they could move into, as an opposite approach was used in the Marine Corps. Ms. James indicated that the Air Force is smaller and a uniquely professional force, so the lessons may not transfer.

Ms. Haines noted that people no longer think of their career in 30-year steps and thus the government should have shorter stints and more mobility. She recognized that with a long career, certain benefits accrue under the existing system, such as retirement benefits, and that shifting to a different system would require a different approach for such benefits, so that employees are not penalized. She questioned whether that should be something directly addressed or noted as a collateral impact.

Ms. James wondered whether the government is currently focused on long-term careers (which NARFE and AFGE promote), and if the Commission could fundamentally change that culture. Ms. James asked if there are tangible benefits to the idea that people should stay for the long term, even if not everyone does. She also pondered whether changes would have unforeseen impacts and if there is an emotional investment of staff that that government would lose. Ms. James noted that while propensity to serve in government is not as rooted in familial service as is service in the military, many public service employees choose to serve because of public servants in their families. Acting Chair Gearan, Ms. Haines, and Ms. James supported a system that would allow different options—short-term positions, long-term careers, and so on—for different people. Ms. Haines described separate promotion tracks in the intelligence community for subject matter experts and management as one way to approach career advancement options for people with different types of goals and skills.

Ms. Skelly recalled one of the most influential conversations she had on this topic was with a military pilot. Aviators are paid well, but everyone cannot stay for a long-time because of the pyramid structure. Ms. Skelly said she saw officers create a bad culture, because they did not like people leaving. It should not be a disrespectful process.

Ms. Skelly's main takeaway from the hearings was that the tools exist, but they are not being put into play for various reasons. She heard the panelists emphasize the need for leadership to take risks.

Mr. Allard was struck by fact that 92% of Senior Executive Service positions come from inside the government. He noted that the system was designed to permit people outside the government to come into the government, with the benefits of leadership experiences in the private sector. Another aspect of the system, as originally designed, was to promote rotational tours, but Mr. Allard was not sure that feature had ever truly been implemented. Vice Chair Wada believed that the Senior Executive Service did not work because of barriers to entry. Ms. Haines asked Mr. Allard what balance he thought would be ideal. Mr. Allard noted that he spent time in and out of government and it was advantageous to have an entrepreneurial approach. Mr. Allard did

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

not think that most people really have long-term career paths in mind at the beginning or sense of where they will end up.

Mr. Khazei found the hearings helpful and believed the Commission should develop a “moonshot” goal for public service. He was surprised by how broken the system was. He noted that private-sector CEOs always emphasize the importance of talent management, but this approach might be difficult to pass in Congress. Mr. Khazei said the Federal government presents an amazing job opportunity, in part because employees can move around while maintaining some stability. Both Mr. Khazei and Acting Chair Gearan noted the absence of a strong constituency advocating for Federal government employees, which makes it challenging to succeed in meaningful civil service reform, particularly in a climate in which politicians of both main parties regularly criticize public servants. Mr. Kilgannon agreed with Mr. Khazei on the need for a bold statement, especially after considering Mr. Stier’s testimony. He felt there could be an opportunity for the Commission to make this statement even if it cannot provide all of the solutions.

Ms. James shifted the topic to USAJobs, noting her surprise that despite its problems, which everyone readily acknowledges, no panelist recommended eliminating it. Ms. James agreed with Commission staff that a more significant problem than the website is the people who run the hiring processes at Federal agencies. She described the solution, as expressed by panelists, as involving a mix of changes to include improved job descriptions, better interviews, and expert review of candidate applications.

Ms. Haines asked Brian Collins, Team Lead for Public Service, what he thought would be the most important recommendation the Commission could make to reform the personnel system. He identified a change in culture as being most important. This would include, among other things, ensuring that agencies maximize the authorities they have, involving subject matter experts and hiring managers more in the process, and having agency heads set a tone from the top by conveying that it is everyone’s job to bring in good talent. Ms. Haines asked Mr. Collins to help develop recommendations for a moonshot focused on talent management, flexibility in careers, and better culture. Relatedly, Ms. James cautioned that when demonstration authorities exist, leadership still may not use it.

Acting Chair Gearan supported a moonshot as well and said that, similar to Mr. Allard, he was concerned about the Senior Executive Service and provided, as an example, the decreasing number of Harvard Law Review editors in the government. Ms. Haines said that statistics show that 92% of SES position holders were in government before, but not whether they had prior private sector experience.

Acting Chair Gearan highlighted differences between the public and private sector and Mr. Kilgannon said that part of the case statement is the mission. He noted that the panelists’ testimonies argued that a clear mission attracted talent. Mr. Kilgannon said describing the problem well is important. Ms. Skelly said this is because there is no dedicated recruitment or advertising in government. The military has a different model, and it spends money on recruiting.

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

Mr. Khazei was surprised and disappointed that NASA, despite clear recognition of its recruiting needs, continued to lack necessary tools. He recommended that a public service moonshot include a proposal for people to do specific jobs for a period and have leaders to support them. He highlighted Mr. Shah's comment that the Federal government is engaged in a war for talent. Mr. Khazei likened the war as one between a soldier on horseback and one with a light saber. He believes there is opportunity in focusing on the mission of public sector employment and creating opportunities not only for life-long careers but for people to do specific jobs for limited periods of time – in short, for people to have a range of experiences. He was less concerned about USAJobs as a platform than how it is used, in other words, with the HR experience as other Commissioners had addressed.

Acting Chair Gearan wondered if the Final Report should call out what he described as a corrosive culture of denigrating bureaucrats. Mr. Barney agreed and felt it important for the Commission's Final Report to be clear that the current approach to the public sector is shameful, wrong, and a disservice to our democracy. Ms. Skelly noted this topic was broached in the Interim Report, albeit in a gentle way.

Mr. Allard returned to the discussion of talent management systems, recalling from his experience being told that developing student interns into full-time employees—a proposal raised in Mr. Stier's testimony—could not effectively be done. Ms. Haines explained that the intelligence community and legal offices throughout the government have more effective programs for hiring interns into full-time positions. Mr. Allard recommended exploring this approach more broadly. Vice Chair Wada said that the student internship program exists across the government but remains subject to leadership priorities and is not consistent across the government.

Mr. Kilgannon said that the war for talent struck him, too, but was concerned about phrasing the issue as a public versus private sector one. Acting Chair Gearan agreed. Ms. Haines explored framing the competition as an issue of national security: unless we invest in the talent the U.S. government needs, we will put at risk our national security. Ms. Haines thought that focusing a recommendation on the budget might be helpful in ensuring the necessary investment is made.

Mr. Barney then talked about strengthening internships, perhaps through a federal fellowship center that led to hiring.

Ms. James then discussed veterans' preference, highlighting expanding it to ten years, but allowing each veteran to only use it once. She foresaw pushback from the veteran community. Mr. Collins emphasized that the VRA and veterans' preference are different and shifting the focus to changing the VRA would make it harder for VSOs to fight it. Mr. Barney and Ms. James agreed that this was the right approach. Vice Chair Wada noted different views among younger and older veterans with respect to veterans' preference and related issues.

Ms. Haines then asked if the preference should be extended to national service alums. Mr. Barney said that people may be disappointed if the Commission does not propose that, but that preferences could not solve everything. Ms. Haines, Mr. Khazei, and Acting Chair Gearan

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

strongly supported the expansion of NCE to the rest of AmeriCorps. Mr. Barney said given that preferences exist for Peace Corps and VISTA, he does not expect opposition.

Ms. Skelly said she would appreciate a threat progress report on these issues, similar to one she saw at the Partnership for Public Service, because it could add some depth as to why service is important. Mr. Lekas said that the ABA and CSIS are exploring a similar concept, connecting the issue of national security preparedness and societal resilience to civic education, which could be a tie-in for the Final Report.

Public Hearing Debrief: Military Service

From 0945 to 1100, the Commission discussed the second day's hearings on military service improvements. All Commissioners present participated in the meeting.

Vice Chair Wada began the discussion by noting that she believed the panels were excellent, and that she believed Mr. Kurta was particularly candid due in part to his imminent retirement. She did not feel the panelists reached a consensus on how to expand awareness but did hear many ideas on how to improve recruiting of people with critical skills.

Ms. Haines highlighted Ms. Camarillo's testimony regarding the Defense Digital Service's (DDS) Jyn program. She noted how leaders developed as part of Jyn return to apply their newly developed abilities to their respective services. She recommended promoting this program more broadly as a way to recruit mid-career professionals with critical skills and as a model for active recruiting. She wondered about ways to increase transparency in the services on how well recruiting and retention was working across the services so that they can share best practices. Vice Chair Wada also endorsed the DDS approach although she observed, based on her own experience, that much of DDS' success is attributable to talented, charismatic leadership. Organizations without a Chris Lynch or Nicole Camarillo may not succeed as well as DDS has. Ms. Skelly cautioned that even with effective leadership, the lessons of DDS may not be scalable across large organizations. Vice Chair Wada and Ms. Skelly also noted promotional challenges that personnel in the DDS program face when they return to their services, with Ms. Skelly suggesting institutional change to incentivize and reward service members who participate in DDS.

Mr. Barney noted that the military services occasionally punish officers for engaging in broadening assignments. He recommended that while most of the force is built on personnel with regimented careers, there should be some exceptions for personnel who engage in these experiences. Ms. Skelly asked whether there were more opportunities for DoD civilian personnel. Ms. Wada stated that she appreciated the point that an old culture needs to be replaced with a new culture.

Acting Chair Gearan asked whether other countries handle personnel management in a better way. Ms. Skelly offered that some countries allow officers to opt out of promotion to become experts in certain skillsets. She noted that the Navy was getting better at such practices, and that Dr. Chu had suggested that such approaches should be expanded to more skillsets.

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

Mr. Barney stated that there were issues with bringing in specialists with no military experience at advanced rank. He argued that the approach wrongly tries to fix a compensation issue with advanced rank. He noted, however, that the approach of giving constructive credit for specialists in staff roles was effective. He also observed that perhaps a separate category of uniformed service, outside current enlisted and officer rank structures, could offer a separate pay band for specialists. He noted that this would fulfill requirements of having warfighters in uniform for the laws of armed conflict.

The Commissioners briefly discussed different ways to classify such specialists. Ms. Wada noted that an important aspect of DDS is the lack of uniform and rank, and that the implementation of a new group of specialist ranks would be challenging. Ms. Skelly argued there was an important human factor, relying on leadership, that enables organizations like DDS to be successful. Ms. Wada said she agreed, and that the focus of recommendations should therefore be upon fixing the culture of the institutions.

Ms. James supported Mr. Barney's idea to create a new rank structure for specialists, and that it reminded her of the warrant officer community—in which experience and expertise is valued over rank. She also noted that the success of the warrant officer model works differently based on the culture of the individual services.

Amy Schafer, Team Lead for Military Service, asked for clarification on whether the group wanted to pursue a warrant officer model versus a chaplain/JAG corps model for cyber officers. She also noted that while DDS is likely not scalable, she suggested that models like AFWERX could be looked at as a model to increase innovation in the services. Ms. Haines offered the pros and cons of using specialty-officer model versus a warrant officer model for managing specialists and suggested that the specialty-officer model may be a better model.

Ms. James noted that within a specialty-officer model, those officers would need to meet all the requirements of a traditional commissioned officer. She offered that there are highly talented personnel that may need to be managed in a non-traditional model. Ms. Wada pointed out that DDS was able to access talented specialists because they sourced talent from within the services, and from elite universities and Silicon Valley.

The conversation then shifted to recommendations to address the civilian-military divide. Mr. Khazei highlighted the testimony of Mr. Chivers and said that he was troubled by how separated the professional military was from the rest of society. He noted, however, that he appreciated that the panelists from the military hearing supported the idea of having a unified call for service across military, national, and public service.

Ms. Skelly asked Mr. Khazei what he thought of Dr. Cohn's point about the tradition of having a small military in the United States. Mr. Khazei stated that while he appreciated her points, he believed that the current AVF period is different because there is no longer even the possibility of the draft. He also noted that he agreed with Dr. Cohn's testimony that the military needs to be representative of society to get young people interested in serving.

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

Ms. Skelly noted that she enjoyed Dr. Hicks' emphasis on civilian control of the military, and Mr. Khazei agreed that this was important to reference. Mr. Khazei also stated that he thought the public comment about starting selective service registration at 17 was interesting because it could be used as an educational tool and to increase solemnity.

Mr. Khazei also supported adapting the ASVAB to be a joint service career tool, and said he appreciated the points related to increasing representation in the services. Ms. Schafer noted that the staff had worked on developing policy recommendations related to the ASVAB. Ms. James stated that there would likely be opposition from communities about expanding the ASVAB. Ms. Schafer added that the DoD may object to diluting the ASVAB from its original version designed for military accessions. Ms. Wada and Ms. Schafer briefly discussed how some states do not share ASVAB data with the DoD. Ms. James observed that there is also opposition to increased test taking.

Mr. Kilgannon stated that he was in favor of having education about the military services and national security included in civics education. He also disliked how panelists did not fully support focusing on this education. Ms. Haines offered that she supported Dr. Hicks's recommendation about improving training and education from civilians in national security. She also argued that it would be worth evaluating the potential international legal implications of asking 17-year-olds to register for selective service, in light of the Optional Protocol on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, which prohibits children under the age of 18 from being compulsorily recruited into the armed forces. Ms. James offered as context a House Bill that would re-designate the selective service as a national service system, requiring Americans to register at age 17. Mr. Khazei observed that he had served on the first National Service Commission with the member of Congress who had introduced the bill on a national service system.

Mr. Kilgannon then mentioned that he enjoyed hearing about the Arizona State University (ASU) model for a national service academy in the public service hearing and wondered whether that model could be expanded to show that service is meant for many and not just for some. Ms. Skelly noted that the ASU model was effectively an ROTC model for public service. Mr. Khazei said that while he supported this model, to be successful it would require on-ramps for service after graduation. Acting Chair Gearan felt the ASU model could be replicated elsewhere and suggested that many other public service-minded university programs already follow a similar model. Ms. Wada and Ms. Skelly discussed cost dynamics related to service on-ramps and the importance of scholarships for educating future service members.

Ms. Schafer interjected that there were some negative reactions to the enlisted education recommendations from panelists and asked whether the Commissioners would like to strike these proposals. Mr. Barney, Ms. James, and Ms. Skelly agreed that there were other policies that similarly required applicants to pay back money if they were not eligible for service. They also supported an idea raised by Mr. Swick to potentially manage participants in the Delayed Entry Pool while they were receiving education.

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

Ms. Wada asked Ms. Schafer about whether she had discussed these options with Sergeant Major of the Army Dan Dailey's team. Ms. Schafer noted that his team did not believe the recommendations would interfere with existing training programs but cautioned against providing too much education prior to service.

Commissioners agreed to keep the recommendations on the table, though they wondered whether the services already had sufficient authority to offer educational incentives.

Mr. Kilgannon mentioned that he strongly supported having recommendations related to physical education.

Mr. Allard and Mr. Barney discussed that authorities provided in the 2019 NDAA were focused on officers because enlisted careers are managed by regulation and not by law.

Deliberation: Final Report Graphics

From 1115 to 1200 ET, Dr. Rough moderated a discussion about the use of graphics in the Final Report. She noted that this was an early opportunity for Commissioners to provide thoughts on how the Final Report should be presented, but that there will be more opportunities in the fall. She also highlighted that the Interim Report was done by staff, but the Final Report will require additional support because of its size and audience. As a result, the Commission has selected a copyeditor and a graphics specialist.

Dr. Rough then introduced Laurel Moran, who has worked as a graphics specialist on several government reports in the past. Ms. Moran shared examples of her prior work; she described her general approach of using a combination of images and icons to help draw out the ideas of the report and make them more visual. She noted that her goal is to make the Final Report look professional and modern. Ms. Moran noted her big critique of the interim report was the need for white space so that people's eyes can rest. She circulated a portion of the interim report that she revised to demonstrate how her work would improve the Commission's deliverables and spur conversation. Dr. Rough then asked the Commissioners to opine on what they liked about the interim report and how they would like to improve upon it.

Several Commissioners raised the topic of how pictures will be used. Ms. James stated that while pictures are fine, they cannot be gratuitous. Vice Chair Wada echoed this sentiment and noted that the pictures must serve a purpose. Ms. Haines stated that she did not want the picture of the Commissioners up front, but rather in the back of the report, so that the focus is on service programs and the content of the report. She added that she would appreciate visuals that emphasize that we need to enhance morale in the civil service space. Mr. Kilgannon said that photos should show a range of ages to help demonstrate that service takes place over the course of one's life, as well as a range of locations to highlight that there are opportunities to serve across the nation. Finally, he suggested that images of a single person in different forms of service would also be helpful. Ms. Moran noted that any photo used should have a text below, which would explain what it is and why it is shown.

The Commissioners generally agreed that they want something eye catching, and the staff should not be hemmed in by the style of previous documents, including not using the Commission seal

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

or particular colors. However, they want the presentation to not undermine the gravity of the topics inside. Mr. Barney suggested that he would prefer a more academic feel. Ms. James specifically stated that she does not want the Final Report to appear glossy or slick. Ms. Moran suggested that slickness can come from artistic choices such as filters that are grungy or images that bleed off the page. Acting Chair Gearan added that paper stock and length also can make things feel glitzier.

Commissioners agreed that the document needs to be easily readable in print and online. Peter Morgan, Director of Operations, explained that the staff posted both pdf and html versions of the Interim Report to the website. The html version allows users to easily jump around the document and facilitates reading on mobile devices or tablets. However, he also cautioned that creating the html version is very time intensive.

Mr. Barney asked how Ms. Moran might convey themes throughout the document. She offered that icons can be helpful and provided an example from one of her previous projects. She also suggested using an icon for each kind of service so that cross-service recommendations would be easier to identify.

Mr. Abernathy and Dr. Rough thanked the Commissioners for their input and noted that the plans for how to rollout the report will be discussed at a future meeting.

Executive Session

Beginning at 1200 ET, Commissioners held an executive session outside the presence of staff.

Preparation for June Hearings

Commissioner Haines, assisted by staff, briefed the Commission on content issues relevant for the June 2019 hearings. This session lasted from 1300 to 1530 ET, after which the Commission concluded its May meeting.

Infrastructure to Serve America

Ms. Haines started by saying that the EWM Work Group had arrived at a consensus on registration. She noted that Chairman Heck raised a new idea at the previous meeting, to suspend Selective Service pre-registration and instead push the public to a broader, voluntary registration system. She said that her recommendation for the staff memo and hearing would be to not try to amend the consensus position right now, but for staff to think about this alternative when writing questions for the panel.

In the consensus memo, the proposal is that the SSS registration system is maintained and there is a separate Serve America system, providing access to all service opportunities, which can be registered for and voluntarily opted-into through the SSS registration process. While there was a discussion on service organizations providing information to SSS, the SSS would not have access to the Serve America database under this model. Mr. Kilgannon expressed an interest in having posters or graphics to point to during the hearing discussion.

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

In contrast, Chairman Heck's model has no mandatory registration in the SSS and the registration system would be used as an alternative database to facilitate a post-mobilization registration in an emergency. Ms. Haines highlighted that this proposal does not answer who would manage the system, how to deal with critical skills issues, or how people would be incentivized to sign up for the voluntary Serve America system.

Vice Chair Wada expressed concern that individuals would not sign up for the system absent some incentive. She did not see the value proposition in Chairman Heck's alternative, and also highlighted the lack of any time and cost estimates needed to reconstitute the Selective Service registration process in a post-mobilization proposal.

Jud Crane, Research Lead for the Selective Service, said that depending on the assumptions, there could be many different SSS models. GAO studies that assume suspending registration, but not other changes, predict \$5.7 million/year in savings, but the reconstitution cost goes up by \$17 million and time goes up by 24 days. With a deep standby model, \$6.6 million/year is saved, but time goes up between 180 and 600 days. Closing it down completely would require 900 days to be fully up and running with a draft.

Mr. Kilgannon said that we save \$23 million if we shut down SSS, but when we think about national security, that cost is irrelevant. Ms. James said that while SSS's cost was an issue for one member of Congress, no one else is concerned because the number amounts to "budget dust."

Mr. Kilgannon said that his primary concern was the amount of time needed to reconstitute. Mr. Barney said that cost savings on an annual basis (even the 11 million from deep standby), carried over a decade, is still not enough to risk the reconstitution failure. Ms. Skelly said that if it is a dire national emergency, having a functional system is all that matters.

Ms. James asked about the scenario in which we went into deep standby and had to reconstitute a system when facing a physical or cyber threat. She expressed concern over whether in such circumstances a system could be developed that was secure. Vice Chair Wada said that reconstitution could be built from IRS data, but noted that some IRS data may be old and it is not easy to readily identify the correct individual. Ms. Haines noted that she shares the concern about reconstitution time, adding that a cyber attack against communications systems could very well target databases as well.

Ms. Haines then shifted the conversation to the details of the June hearing. Ms. Morgan Levey, Public Engagement Officer, described the panels and panelists. Ms. Haines noted that each of the panelists are meant to provide an important perspective: BG Scott Durham can analyze how a Serve America database interacts with military recruiting; the marketer, Drew Train, would speak to people's interest in signing up for a voluntary registration system; Dakota Wood, who is from a think tank, would speak to an opt-in option and privacy concerns; and Dorothy Stoneman, a panelist who founded YouthBuild, would be able to speak to the state and local aspects of registration. Dr. Rough noted that there are military and national service representatives, but a public service perspective is not represented.

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

Ms. Levey said that the last open spot is for a behavioral economist, which has been difficult to identify because we are looking for someone who can speak to how to drive users to the program and how individuals make choices.

Vice Chair Wada asked if the panel would also discuss pre versus post-mobilization issues and Dr. Rough and Ms. Haines said that it would not.

Civic Education

Ms. Haines described the June hearing and the status of the working group's deliberations of civic education options. She stated that the first proposal for voting is on encouraging nonfederal authorities, such as specific recommendations for K-12 students and IHE's. Appendix A includes specific recommendations and Appendix B includes best practice guidelines. In addition, the working group looked at ways to promote civic education and awareness and proposals that involved the federal government. Mr. Lekas added that one proposal pushes the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) exam to all students. This would apply the test to all states and disaggregate testing by states in reporting. This would not require much funding. Ms. Haines stated that the working group attempted to draw a comparison between spending on civics and STEM, and Mr. Lekas said that it is important to not dismiss the importance of STEM as well.

Ms. Haines then discussed mandatory service options, highlighting that the work group was looking at three options: a semester long option for service learning, a summer of service learning, and service learning being incorporated into the classroom. She suggested that an option could be partial funding for schools interested in implementing one of these proposals and that the federal government would not dictate whether the program was mandatory or voluntary as a condition of receiving funding. This proposal would hopefully result in widespread piloting. Acting Chair Gearan stated that this program would be expensive and difficult to do well.

Mr. Lekas then previewed other proposals such as the mobile constitution center and the organization of resources in the federal government. These proposals were still in editing and would be updated later. Ms. James expressed concern about focusing on K-12, asking if hearing participants would focus on college education. Mr. Lekas said that CIRCLE could talk to both areas. Ms. Levey then elaborated on the June panel and the confirmed participants.

Prepared by Paul Lekas, General Counsel

Adopted by the Commission on June 19, 2019