

**DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN THE SERVICES (DACOWITS)
MEETING MINUTES
October 18-19, 2005**

DACOWITS held a meeting October 18-19, 2005, at the DoubleTree Hotel, Crystal City, National Airport, 300 Army-Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia. Members and public present during the meeting are at enclosures 1 and 2.

18 October 2005

LtGen Mutter outlined the agenda focus for the first day of the meeting. She introduced the HRH Princess, Brigadier General, Aishia of the Royal Jordanian Army and Mr. Bob Kaufman former DACOWITS member. The Committee started discussion on the most recent site visits performed by Committee members.

LtGen Mutter started the discussion with her and Dr. Davis' visit. She stated that family groups were very candid about the impact on children of deployed parents. She also noted the concerns expressed by female Service members when addressing the civilianization of positions. Dr. Davis also noted that female Service members made comments about the height and weight standards and the contracting out of jobs. Both concurred there was a robust discussion with the dual military members about their quality of life and that the Base enjoyed wonderful community support.

Col Shaw addressed his visit by stating that the frequent changes that the unit received in preparation for deployment, during training at Ft Drum and upon redeployment seemed to be the major concern of the unit.

Mrs. Robson noted that her unit also expressed significant distress with frequent changes and poor leadership. She expressed comments made by the Service members about physical fitness requirements.

Dr. Nelson stated that her unit had a wonderful family program with direct involvement by the leadership. Two features she noted was the best person was left behind to take care of the families during the deployment and the unit commander sent weekly emails to the families to keep them informed.

Her next visit demonstrated significant programs that were used to address a population of Service members that had deployed more than once and possibly a third time. The programs addressed interventions for taking care of children when the non-deployed primary care giver becomes unable and the Service member is deployed. Her location implemented full time child care, qualified on-call personnel and the extensive use of powers of attorney for the on-call personnel to expand the number of people who can pick up and care for children in emergencies. Additionally, they were using liaisons in the schools to help with crisis prevention and increase awareness of the issues of children with deployed parents. She commended the base for the numerous problem-solving solutions and innovative ideas to address these issues. She also noted many people in the focus groups were interested in leaving the military.

Mrs. Hoffmann and Ms. O'Neill addressed their trip. They said morale was outstanding. Their visit indicated a shortage of child care spaces and noted creative efforts in the school system to address children of deployed parents. Ms. O'Neill also addressed the concern Service members expressed about civilianization, contracting of positions and transformation. She observed wide-spread distrust and suspicion of these changes. Ms. O'Neill also noted that younger female Service members were concerned about injuries during physical fitness training while more experienced female Service members had learned techniques to avoid injuries.

Senator Duniphan spoke of her site visit. She noted high morale. She stated Service members wanted more day care spaces, longer hours for day care and less cost for day care. Service members also addressed physical fitness; they did not feel the system was fair. They wanted fitness standards but wanted them to be more flexible. Dr. Nelson also noted that her location had a shortage of infant care.

Mrs. Silberman stated that personnel at her location also noted child care alternatives during discussions with day care administrators. She said that in home care was being used but that Service members did not trust this alternative. Navy POC CAPT Speed stated the on-post Child Development Centers are working to bolster the trust of Service members in other options.

Senator Duniphan addressed her second site visit also noting again day care and weight standards. She said morale was high. Female Service members were very positive and ready to do their mission.

The Committee recessed between 10:00 a.m. and 10:15a.m.

Mrs. Rowell asked that before the Committee moved forward on the agenda items that the Committee address an issue found in the mobilization package of her son-in-law. The package had a TRICARE information sheet which listed TRICARE options. The last option asked the Service members to check a block that stated, "I'm not smart enough to figure this out by myself, who do I talk to?" The Members asked the inappropriate nature of this option be addressed by the OSD.

LtGen Mutter then moved into the discussion of the 2004 Report responses from the Military Departments, Coast Guard and OSD. Col Dailey briefed the responses to the 2004 Report findings and recommendations. Also discussed was Chapter V of the DACOWITS 2005 Report which is the compilation of the 2003 and 2004 Report responses. (See Enclosure 3) LtGen Mutter wanted to discuss the findings and recommendations from Chapter V first as they may already capture some of findings and recommendations from the other chapters of the 2005 Report.

LtGen Mutter addressed the first finding from Chapter V as the gap between the Service Support programs and their implementation as noted by the Committee over the past three years. The recommendation is to use other methods to increase awareness. Additionally, the recommendation will suggest a higher standard for utilization of these services considering the high operations tempo and the needs of Service members and families. LtGen Mutter said she would keep it general and use as an example Military OneSource.

LtGen Mutter addressed the 2004 recommendation to mail out initial information to families of deploying members. Mr. Retherford, OSD Military Personnel Policy POC, stated that the RAND study on impact of deployment on families also collaborated a mixed usage of these support services by Service members and families. Committee members recommended mail outs and wanted the Services to commit to a mail out program for initial contact. The Committee discussed the response of the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command which requires a 100% contact of the family members of deployed Service members. A monthly report is provided to the Army Regional Readiness Commands.

The third finding concerning Military OneSource was found to be redundant with the first finding and they will be combined. It also addresses measures of effectiveness. Dr. Davis, expressed concern about the anonymous nature of the Military OneSource. Mrs. Silberman also talked about usage. Is it being used enough to justify its cost? Ms. O'Neill noted that the Marines seemed to know about the program. Mrs. Morgan, OSD Military Community and Family Policy POC, noted the Marines were the pilot program and the Navy was the last service to implement the program. She also noted that if people do not need it they will not know about it.

LtGen Mutter then addressed recommendation number four. Questions have been added to the Status of Forces Surveys and the Committee will continue to address these issues and the need to follow the data on children and work life balance.

It was determined that recommendation number five would be worded to focus on the need for skills and appropriate year group sizes.

The Committee wants to support the DoD efforts to change officer management and allow for more flexibility for women and families. During discussion of recommendation number six Dr. Davis recommended that we restate the original finding and the Services' responses to help with clarity. The Committee discussed a number of ways to emphasize recommendations that the Committee thinks need more attention by the DoD.

In recommendation number seven on child care issues the Committee discussed better ways to emphasis, getting child care costs into regular budget cycles and not supplemental. Col Dailey mentioned that modular building efforts authorized at child care facilities provide more flexibility to increase spaces than having to use Military Construction Authorization funding. Mrs. Morgan mentioned that all Services are working toward their goals. Mrs. Silberman suggested that the recommendation be written to also recognize the efforts of the Services.

In recommendation number eight the Committee wanted more frequent surveys of family members and will recommend an annual survey of families.

Concerning recommendation number nine the Committee wanted to emphasize that training on the management of pregnant Service members has to be incorporated at all levels of leadership training. In particular they want to emphasis it for junior leadership schools.

The Committee felt strongly that at least some sexual assault training be gender segregated. The decision was to reemphasize this recommendation to all the Services.

The Committee discussed the sabbatical programs and the disapproval of these programs Office of Management and Budget. Members discussed how to best frame a recommendation. The Committee wanted to support pilot programs to at least allow the DoD to look at these options.

Mrs. Rowell wanted last year's recommendation for not deploying dual military couples with small children simultaneously to be readdressed. Mr. Retherford stated that the Congress will also ask the DoD to look at this area for dual military couples. It was included in the House mark up. The Members also noted that some dual military couples want to deploy together to get the separation over in a year, instead of consecutive deployment of the parents over two years.

The Committee went on to discuss leaving open or closing last years' recommendations.

The committee broke for lunch at 12:00 p.m. and returned at 1:00 p.m.

The Committee continued discussion of the disposition of 2004 findings and recommendations until 2:00 p.m. when they recessed for 15 minutes. Refer to enclosure 3 for disposition of the 2004 findings and recommendations.

The Committee reconvened at 2:15 p.m. LtGen Mutter asked for volunteers to write the Executive Summary for the 2005 Report. Mrs. Silberman said she would be the lead on the Executive Summary. The Chair also discussed how the

Committee would be working the 2005 findings and recommendations for the next day and a half. She wanted to go through the draft findings and recommendations and discuss them in concept. If there are revisions that need to be made they will be worked on over the next few weeks and the Committee will vote on them at the next meeting.

Dr. Davis who drafted the findings and recommendations for the National Guard and Reserve Component subcommittee began the discussion of Reserve Component section of the 2005 Report. (See Enclosure 3 for the draft findings and recommendations for Guard and Reserve.) The Committee agreed that a recommendation was needed to address protection of Reserve Component individuals who are in school. There was general agreement that legislation similar to "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA)" is needed to protect Reserve Component students when they are deployed. Senator Duniphan stated that several States have already accomplished this type of legislation.

The Committee also discussed the allocation of military training to the Reserve Component. Dr. Davis pointed out there is a perception that the National Guard and Reserve receive fewer military training slots than their requirement. The Committee asked for the finding to be written to highlight the lack of training opportunities provided to the Reserves.

The Members discussed the needs of children during deployment. Child care and stress counseling for the Reserve Component was addressed in the Committee members' discussion.

The Committee took a break at 3:15p.m. and returned at 3:30p.m.

The Committee then discussed the experience of mobilization for the Reserve Component Service members and family members. The Committee discussed the location of these recommendations, if they should be in the Reserve Component section of the report or in the Family section of the 2005 Report. It was decided that issues addressing children needed to be in the Family section. They also decided they would develop a recommendation to the National Guard Bureau to broaden the *Childcare Needs Assessment Survey* to dual military families, single parents and special needs children.

The Committee discussed recommendations on additional efforts to advertise the many programs available to Service members of the Reserve Component. The Family subcommittee stated they have a recommendation to add full time staff members to units. Dr. Davis agreed that several issues would need to be combined to represent the recommendations that Service members made concerning ways to improve support services.

The Committee then discussed the need for legal counseling. The close proximity of states in the Northeast creates Reserve units that have members from these different states. Briefings for these Reserve unit members were inadequate because state laws concerning child custody and property were different from state to state. Briefers and legal assistance resources were unable to answer questions concerning these differing state laws.

In the recruiting and retention section, the Committee decided to address shorter deployments as the recommendation for trying to maintain the current good level of retention and improve recruiting results. Based on briefings, surveys and focus group results, The Committee generally agreed that 6 months was the optimal length for an extended deployment. The Committee also discussed better predictability of the deployment schedule and reducing frequency as ways to maintain retention and improve recruiting.

Dr. Davis wanted to emphasize that tracking the number of man-days for Reserve Component members is not consolidated and does not lend itself to fully assessing the impact of Reserve Component service. State active duty for the National Guard is more difficult to fold into the Federal Title 10 and Title 32 calculations. The full hardship of State active duty call ups on Service members, families and employers is difficult to assess.

Public forum was opened at 4:45 p.m. LTC Patricia Larrabee provided statements on the Former Spouses Protection Act. (See Enclosure 3)

LtGen Mutter adjourned day one at 5:00 p.m.

19 October 2005

LtGen Mutter called day two to order at 8:30 a.m. She emphasized that the purpose of the meeting was to get feedback on the initial findings and recommendations, work on them between meetings and vote on them next meeting.

The Career Opportunities subcommittee discussed the work they did on findings and recommendations. (See Enclosure 3) Mrs. Silberman led the discussion. The Career Opportunities section had several issues that overlapped with the Family group and they collaborated to include them in the Family section of the 2005 report. The first recommendation the Committee wanted to discuss was the lack of time to address physical fitness and educational requirements brought up by Service members during their focus groups. The Committee decided to address the educational requirement mentioned by Service members through a recommendation that stresses greater use of technology to assist Service members in meeting these requirements. The relaxation of education requirements during deployment was also discussed.

The Committee also discussed women's concerns about returning to physical fitness and weight standards after pregnancy. After discussion they decided to request better clarity in the service regulations to assist with the concerns of women.

Dr. Davis discussed an outreach program which would reach Service members at critical junctures in their life such as marriage, birth, etc.

The Committee discussed what is being taught at basic training. The Committee discussed including family planning at basic training to be proactive in preventing family issues later in Service members' careers.

The focus groups recommend a mobile training program to help NCOs obtain the leadership training they need to get promoted. It was determined that educational adjustments are ongoing, particularly in the Army, to ensure this training is received. Significant discussion occurred about getting training to family members about the basics of the military life style. Discussion about incentives for spouses to participate in these activities was also discussed as a recommendation. Discussion centered on including this recommendation in Chapter V as a program that DoD needs to improve.

Mrs. Silberman discussed the transformation section of the Career Opportunities chapter. The members of the Career Opportunities subcommittee will write a recommendation that captures some of the apprehension of the Service members about transformation and requests greater clarification of transformation. The concern is there is a disproportionate impact on women when jobs are civilianized or career fields are changed during transformation.

Significant discussion on transformation occurred. The purpose, intent, and outcomes of transformation were discussed. Mr. Retherford noted there is a robust debate going on between DoD and Congress to understand the impact of transformation. There is a DoD Directive that requires the services to assess the impact of transformation on career fields.

The Committee took a break from 10:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.

The Family subcommittee then discussed its findings and recommendations for the 2005 Report.(See Enclosure Three) Ms. O'Neill started the session with a discussion of the use of volunteers to support the family readiness systems of all the Services. Her position was that there is an over reliance on the volunteer system. The chain of command needs to be more involved and the system needs more paid support personnel employed at smaller unit levels. She felt this was particularly acute during high deployment periods. The Committee discussed various ways to write the recommendation.

Mrs. Rowell discussed the lack of current research on the impact of deployment on children. She stated she wanted a recommendation that addressed this issue. The Committee continued the discussion about limiting the length of deployments for families. The Committee noted the "Guide for Helping Communities Address Deployment" is an excellent publication and needs greater distribution. Mrs. Rowell discussed several family related recommendations that would be included in the next voting session.

Ms. O'Neill also wanted to address the DoD school system and an appropriate recommendation to sustain the current number of these schools.

The Committee discussed a recommendation on the impact of news media on the families. The members noted that even in unsolicited discussion with family members and Service members the negative news on the media was brought up. The Committee discussed various ways to encourage positive news of Service members' contributions.

The Committee also noted that the family member spouses, who experienced a shorter deployment of their military spouses, also expressed greater satisfaction with military life. The Committee tied that finding back to a recommendation for shorter deployments for Service members to relieve the stress on military families.

Additionally, the report noted that military families express more satisfaction with military life when leadership promotes and exhibits family friendly policies. The Committee discussed including in Commander's evaluations comments that hold the chain of command accountable for effective family support programs and policies.

The Committee finished in discussion of the findings and recommendations of the Family section of the 2005 Report

The Committee broke for lunch at 12:00p.m.

The Committee came back at 1:15p.m. to address administrative issues that deal with the writing of the report. The Committee discussed how to format the report section and the findings and recommendations. The members stressed that recommendations should be tied to either the focus group findings or the research data included in the report. They decided they would not be discussed the prioritization of the recommendations.

The Committee then discussed a section in the 2005 Report that would capture the best practices the Committee saw during their installation visits.

Col Denise Daily signature

LtGen Carol Mutter signature

Reported submitted by
COL Denise Dailey, USA
Military Director, DACOWITS

Report certified by
LtGen Carol Mutter, USMC (Ret)
FY 2005 DACOWITS Chair

Attachments as Stated

Enclosure 1

DACOWITS MEMBERS' ATTENDANCE AT OCT 18-19, 2005 MEETING

Committee Members Present Oct 18, 2005

Dr. Lynda Davis
Mrs. Margaret Hoffmann
LtGen Carol Mutter, USMC, Retired
Ms. Kate O'Neill
Mrs. Margaret Robson
Mrs. Virginia Rowell
Col Vance Shaw, USAFR, Retired
Mrs. Rosalie (Ricky) Silberman
Sen. J.P. Duniphan
Dr. Mary Nelson
Ambassador Ellen Sauerbrey

Committee Members Present Oct 19, 2005

Dr. Lynda Davis
Mrs. Margaret Hoffmann
LtGen Carol Mutter, USMC, Retired
Ms. Kate O'Neill
Mrs. Margaret Robson
Mrs. Virginia Rowell
Col Vance Shaw, USAFR, Retired
Mrs. Rosalie (Ricky) Silberman
Sen. J.P. Duniphan
Ambassador Ellen Sauerbrey

Not Present Oct 19, 2005

Dr. Mary Nelson
Mrs. Bonnie Fuller Ford

Enclosure 2

Sign in sheets

Enclosure 3

[Chapter V 2005 Report](#)

[DACOWITS 2004 Report Presentation Service and Staff Responses](#)

[Notes Service Responses 2004](#)

Disposition of 2004 Responses

[National Guard and Reserve Draft Findings and Recommendations 18 October](#)

Public Forum Documents

1. [Former Spouses Protection Act Public Forum](#)
2. [Former Spouses Protection Act \(FSPA\)](#)

[Career Opportunities Draft Findings and Recommendations 19 October](#)

[Family Sections Draft Findings and Recommendations 17 October](#)