

DACOWITS RFIs for December 2020 QBM

CO-LOCATION AND GEOGRAPHIC STABILITY RETENTION INITIATIVES

(R&R)

In 2017, the Committee made three recommendations on potential policy updates to dual-military co-location:

- The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to review and consider revising their active duty dual-military co-location policies to incorporate the best practice from the Navy of establishing additional oversight from a higher-level authority should an assignment manager/detailer be unable to accommodate co-location.
- The Secretary of Defense should consider establishing a DoD policy that would make it mandatory for assignment managers/detailers to work across the Military Services to maximize the co-location of inter-Service active duty dual-military couples.
- The Secretary of Defense should consider expanding the co-location policy to include any active duty dual-military parents, regardless of marital status, who share parental custody of the same minor child(ren) and desire to be assigned within the same geographic location for the benefit of his and/or her minor child(ren).

To date, only the Air Force has revised their co-location policy to assign Service members with court-ordered child custody decrees near their children. DACOWITS continues to be interested in the retention of servicewomen and believes co-location and geographic stability are contributing factors to success in this area.

| | |
|----------|--|
| 1 | The Committee requests a written response from the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) to provide statistics on the number/percentage of dual-military co-located Service members for each Service branch broken down by gender, race, ethnicity, and grade from 2009-2019. |
| 2 | The Committee requests a written response from the Military Services (to include the Coast Guard and Space Force) on the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide any current or planned policies regarding geographic stability for Service members. b. Identify criteria and process for considering exceptions to policy and approval. c. Is geographic stability being used as an incentive for personnel retention? Include any changes in trends related to promotion, professional development, schooling, assignments, etc. |
| 3 | The Committee request a written response from the Air Force on their recent Total Force crossflow policy changes. Provide details on the new policy; the rationale for the change; and any expectations relative to improved retention. |

INCLUSIVITY IN THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

(R&R)

In 2014, DACOWITS began studying the Military Selective Service Act (MSSA). In 2014, the Committee reviewed the SSS' 2013 Annual Report and received a briefing on the constitutionality of the MSSA from the DoD Office of General Counsel. In 2015, the Committee made the following recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should recommend legislation that mandates women between the ages of 18 and 26 fulfill the same Selective Service registration requirements as men.*

In 2017, the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service was established by Congress to review the military Selective Service process and to consider methods to increase participation in military, national, and public service. In [September 2020](#), the Commission briefed DACOWITS on its recommendations to Congress. During the 2021 research year, the Committee will reexamine the impacts of including women in the MSSA.

| | |
|----------|---|
| 4 | The Committee requests a written response from the Department of Defense on the Department's policy and stated position regarding inclusion of women in the MSSA. |
|----------|---|

DACOWITS RFIs for December 2020 QBM

| | | |
|--|--|-------|
| WOMEN IN SPACE | | (R&R) |
| <p>DACOWITS recognizes that the standing up of a new Service enables key opportunities to shape a talent-driven and diverse workforce that can incorporate modern policies relating to recruitment and retention. In March 2020, DACOWITS was briefed that the U.S. Space Force (USSF) intends to utilize innovative career models and personnel processes based on a 21st century approach to Human Capital Management, which include added flexibility for women to pursue opportunities both within and outside of the Space Force; opportunities in highly technical fields for women with STEM backgrounds; Service transfer options to leverage a broad range of skill sets and experiences; offering opportunities for women to serve in leadership roles; and a unique shaping opportunity to establish a values-based culture that emphasizes equal opportunity, fair treatment, and respect.</p> | | |
| 5 | <p>In March 2020 in response to RFI 9, the Office of the Chief of Space Operations provided an overview briefing. The Committee requests an updated briefing from the Office of the Chief of Space Operations on the status of the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What is your current end strength and how many positions have been filled to date? What is the projection for total end strength? In filling the current positions, what Service transfer options were used? Were any positions filled from industry and/or are there plans to fill any positions from industry? b. What systems, infrastructure, and policies are needed to build an environment that is inclusive to servicewomen? c. What added flexibility exists for servicewomen to pursue opportunities both within and outside of the USFF (e.g., career intermission program and return to USSF, service in the Reserve Component, special programs not offered within the USFF (i.e., recruiting, instructor duty, etc.)? d. What structure, organization, governance, career development, and training are needed to develop an inclusive workplace for servicewomen? e. What innovative career models and personnel processes based on a 21st century approach to Human Capital Management are being pursued to recruit and retain servicewomen? f. What leadership roles exist and what is the current percentage of Service members assigned to these positions by rank and gender? g. What authorities are you using for implementation? Are there any authorities that you would like to have, that you do not have currently? h. How are you establishing of a values-based culture that emphasizes equal opportunity, fair treatment, and respect? Are there core values that have been developed? What are some of the organizational management practices that are being used to ensure an inclusive environment? | |
| 6 | <p>The Committee requests a written response from the Coast Guard on any lessons learned (positive and/or negative) from the creation of the Department of Homeland Security that could be leveraged by the USSF. Please include any innovative approaches to expanding gender diversity at all levels within the organization.</p> | |
| ARMY COMBAT FITNESS TEST (ACFT) | | (E&I) |
| <p>During 2020, the Committee examined the development and preliminary implementation of the new age- and gender-neutral Army Combat Fitness Test (ACFT), which is slated to replace the nearly 40-year-old Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) and become the new official test of record. For the 2021 research year, the Committee will continue to review this topic. Of note, the NDAA for FY21, Sec. 592, states the Army cannot implement the ACFT until a study is conducted by an independent entity.</p> | | |
| 7 | <p>The Committee requests a written response from Army on the following: The results of the University of Iowa’s independent validation of the ACFT baseline performance standards, to include any assessment that addressed physiological gender differences.</p> | |

DACOWITS RFIs for December 2020 QBM

| WOMEN IN AVIATION | | (E&I) |
|---|---|-------|
| <p>During 2020, the Committee examined women in aviation. For the 2021 research year, the Committee will continue to review this topic. The Committee remains concerned that women have been serving as aviators since the 1970s and that despite the Combat Exclusion policy being lifted in 1993, the overall percentage of female aviators remains low in comparison with their male counterparts.</p> | | |
| 8 | <p>As a follow-up to the December 2019 response to RFI 5A, the Committee requests an updated written response from Navy and Marine Corps on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The total number of (officer) pilots by rank, broken out by gender. In addition, provide the total number of designated female pilots (officers) by platform. Provide whole numbers, as well as the percent of the total community, broken out by rank and gender. b. The total number of Naval Flight Officers (NFOs) by rank, broken out by gender. In addition, provide the total number of designated female NFOs by platform. Provide whole numbers, as well as the percent of total community, and breakdown by rank. | |
| 9 | <p>The Committee is interested in the process and criteria for assigning pilots to their initial pipeline community (Navy and Marine Corps) or Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC). The response to the Committee’s December 2019 RFI 5A – Women in Aviation indicates Air Force female aviators make up 9 percent of the mobility pilots (442 of 5042), but only 2 percent of the fighter pilots (65 of 2638); and Navy data shows twice the number of women assigned to rotary wing platforms (47 percent of women) vs. tactical aviation (23 percent of women).</p> <p>The Committee requests a briefing from the Army, Navy, Marines and Air Force to address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What is the criteria for assigning flight students to their initial pipeline? Please provide any data on the criteria used. How does an individual’s performance, their preferred pipeline, and anthropometric data influence the assignment? Please provide any data or metrics available, especially as it applies to women aviators and why there are fewer women in tactical aircraft vs. rotary wing or mobility. b. In FY20, how many women pilots (officers) were limited in their pipeline assignment by body weight, height, or anthropometric measurements? Please provide data on the limiting factor and the pipeline from which they were restricted. | |
| 10 | <p>The Committee is interested in recruitment and retention of female officer aviators (<u>paygrades O1-O9</u>) and the initiatives in place to encourage female aviators to remain in on Active Duty at the end of their service commitment. Despite female aviators being eligible to fly non-combat aircraft for 45 years and combat aircraft for 26 years, only a few have advanced to the highest ranks, and the overall percentage of senior women in aviation remains low.</p> <p>The Committee requests a written response from the Military Services (to include the Coast Guard) to address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What is your Service doing to attract more female officer pilots? Provide the annual accession rates for each of the last 10 years for female officer pilots. b. Provide annual retention rates for each of the last 10 years for female officer pilots who remained on Active Duty upon the completion of their service obligation. Compare to retention rates for male pilots. In addition, please provide a separate breakdown for NFOs, Combat Systems Officers, and Air Battle Managers. c. Discuss any ongoing initiatives to improve female aviator retention. d. What monetary incentive bonuses are available for aviators to remain on Active Duty beyond their service obligation? What has the take rate been by gender? | |

DACOWITS RFIs for December 2020 QBM

IMPROVING CHILDCARE PROVISIONS FOR SERVICEWOMEN

(WB&T)

Over the last 40 years, DACOWITS has made 35 recommendations specific to child care. Comprehensive child care continues to be an ongoing challenge for Service members. Service members with children represent a large percentage of the overall force, making adequate childcare critical to the Department’s mission. The Committee remains concerned with the ongoing challenges pertaining to child care. For 2021, the Committee will continue examining this topic.

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 11 | <p>The Committee remains concerned about the ongoing child care needs of servicewomen and the resulting impact to unit readiness and operations.</p> <p>The Committee requests a briefing from the <u>Military Community and Family Policy (MC&FP)</u> on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify all the types of child care fee assistance programs available to Service members both on and off-installation and eligibility requirements. b. Is there any fee discounting or tiered-payment scale for lower enlisted/junior officer for on-installation care at either the CDC or family child care homes? c. Does fee assistance for off-base DoD/Services certified child care cover the full cost charged by those facilities? d. What provisions exist to offset the cost for off-installation child care options not certified by the Services (e.g. before/after school care at a child’s school or in a residence)? e. What options exist to offset the cost for off-installation child care in remote locations (e.g., recruiters, Coast Guard, etc.), or for those serving in the Reserve and Guard components who typically lack access to CDCs or on-installation care? f. What other financial assistance initiatives are being planned or being considered to address this pressing need? |
| 12 | <p>During the June 2019 business meeting in response to RFI 5, the Military Services briefed the Committee on child care.</p> <p>The Committee requests an updated briefing from the <u>Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force</u> on progress in this area, to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Current and new initiatives to expand child care support to Service members (e.g., 24/7 facilities). b. Current and new initiatives to increase awareness of child care options and resources. c. On-installation child care options available to Service members to accommodate hourly (i.e., less than full day), irregular (e.g., 6PM-6AM), or overnight care. |

DACOWITS RFIs for December 2020 QBM

PREGNANCY IN THE MILITARY

(WB&T)

Over the past few decades, the Committee has examined pregnancy and parenthood issues, resulting in many recommendations. For 2021, the Committee will examine the impacts of pregnancy and the postpartum period on a servicewoman’s ability to progress in her military career, to include pregnancy discrimination.

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 13 | <p>During the September 2020 business meeting in response to RFI 6, the Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) provided a briefing and indicated that the DoDI 1350.02, Military Equal Opportunity Program, is currently under review and that pregnancy discrimination will be added as a subset of sex discrimination – pending final coordination and approval.</p> <p>The Committee requests that ODEI provide a copy of the newly revised DoDI 1350.02 and an accompanying written response that explains the new provisions related to pregnancy discrimination, the deadline for Service implementation, and any measures directed to be taken by the Services.</p> |
| 14 | <p>The Committee continues to be concerned about the persistence of negative attitudes toward pregnancy and pregnant servicewomen in the military and that their career progression may be adversely impacted. The Committee will examine pregnancy discrimination in the Services and, to that end, is interested in learning about Service actions, education and other initiatives to eliminate pregnancy discrimination in the Services and to address the cultural pregnancy bias and stigma that many past focus group participants have described they experienced.</p> <p>The Committee requests a briefing from each of the Military Services (to include the Coast Guard and Space Force) on the actions taken and initiatives planned to assure pregnant servicewomen experience no adverse career impacts resulting from their pregnancy or postpartum period (e.g., breastfeeding/lactation needs; taking of primary or secondary caregiver leave; etc.). Please address the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What safeguards have been put in place to prevent servicewomen from being adversely impacted due to pregnancy/postpartum? b. What training do commanders and supervisors receive regarding how to address pregnancy/postpartum in their units? Does this training include how to prevent and mitigate negative attitudes and bias towards pregnant/postpartum servicewomen? c. Does your Service have any measures in place to track career progression and promotion of pregnant servicewomen? What are they? d. Has your Service conducted any surveys or undertaken other measures to solicit feedback from servicewomen about their workplace and career experiences as a result of their pregnancy and/or postpartum leave/lactation requirements? What were the findings of those surveys? e. How does your Service make reassignment determinations when servicewomen must be temporarily reassigned to other duties due to pregnancy, regardless of whether for individual or occupational-wide profile reasons? Do servicewomen have the opportunity to provide input on such reassignments? And who within the command has decision authority for such reassignments? Specifically identify how evaluation reports and follow-on assignments of those temporarily removed/reassigned from their specialty field due to pregnancy and operational deferments are handled. f. How does your Service make reassignment determinations for servicewomen who must be reassigned while on postpartum operational deferment? Do servicewoman have the opportunity to provide input on such reassignment? And who within the command has decision authority for such reassignments? g. What are your Services’ physical fitness testing requirements and deferment period for pregnant and postpartum servicewomen? h. For Space Force: As the newest Service, with expanded authorities, how do you plan to address a-g above? |