

DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN THE SERVICES (DACOWITS)

Quarterly Meeting Minutes

17–18 September 2019

The Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services (DACOWITS) held a quarterly business meeting September 17–18, 2019. The meeting took place at the Key Bridge Marriott, 1401 Lee Highway, Arlington, VA, 22209.

17 September 2019

Welcome and Opening Remarks

COL Toya Davis, DACOWITS Military Director and Designated Federal Officer, opened the September quarterly business meeting by reviewing the Committee's establishment and charter. COL Davis reminded those in attendance that any comments made during the meeting by Committee members are their personal opinions and do not reflect a DACOWITS or Department of Defense position. COL Davis then turned the meeting over to Gen (Ret.) Janet Wolfenbarger, DACOWITS Chair.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked all Committee members and meeting attendees to introduce themselves.

Status of Requests for Information

COL Davis reviewed the status of the Committee's requests for information (RFIs). The Committee received responses to all 11 of its requests. All the written responses to the RFIs were published on the DACOWITS website.

Brief: Status of Gender-Integrated U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Training (RFI 2)

The Committee continues to be interested in women's integration into previously closed career fields and positions. Given that the initial training environment is fundamental to Service members' readiness, the Committee requested a briefing from the Marine Corps on the status of gender-integrated training at Marine Corps Recruit Depot Parris Island to include an analysis, lessons learned, and a discussion of future plans based on the January 2019 training cycle.

The Marine Corps briefer began by stating that the Service and the Committee share the same agenda of wanting servicewomen to succeed and that he believed the model the Marine Corps is using sets the Service up for success. The briefer acknowledged that many want to see gender integration at the platoon level in recruit training but that the Marine Corps does not believe that is a good model based on its initial findings from an analysis of other Services' approaches. The briefer stated the Marine Corps has examined the issue and believes its conclusions are correct

but is seeking to sponsor an independent study, without Marine Corps involvement, to test its approach to recruit training. The Service is developing a proposal to select a university or academic group to conduct the independent study to assess gender integration in the recruit training environment.

The Marine Corps briefer said the female attrition rate for recruits is 13 percent. He said the closest comparable model for Marine Corps recruit training is the Army's training at Fort Benning, where the attrition rate for women was 45 percent for the infantry and armor career fields. Fort Benning's program is used as a comparison case because of the heavy focus on combat arms, which differs from other installations and training programs in other Services.

One of the challenges the Marine Corps is trying to overcome is teaching young men how to appropriately treat young women. The briefer stated that integrating recruit training down to the platoon level will not address this particular issue. Previously recruits were not seeing female leaders during their recruit training, but the Marine Corps has now changed that. Drill instructors at the platoon level are the same sex as the recruits, however, leadership at the company and battalion levels is now integrated.. A challenge for the Marine Corps is that some young people have grown up in a culture that does not reinforce that individuals should treat others with respect, which is problematic.

The briefer stated that when the Marine Corps' social media issues began, he talked to young Marines who had posted inappropriate items but did not think that they had done anything wrong. The Marine Corps has not solved these important issues in the ranks, including sexual assault and racism. He mentioned a recent news story from Hawaii about Marines who had defaced a statue with a swastika. The briefer said a Marine who cannot understand courage, honor, and commitment will no longer be a Marine. The Marine Corps is committed to the success of female Marines because the Service needs diversity in its ranks. He said that the complex challenges the Service is facing today need to be met with diverse answers and that "groupthink" is the path toward irrelevance.

Discussion

Dr. Kyleanne Hunter noted that during the recent confirmation hearing of General David Berger, Commandant of the Marine Corps, he stated that the first integrated Marine Corps recruit training company performed as well as, if not better than, other companies on every metric measured; however, there has not been another integrated company since then. Dr. Hunter asked about the message being sent on a macro level to new female recruits that the Marine Corps is choosing to continue to keep men and women separated despite the lack of negative impacts observed in the first integrated company. She noted that it seems the Marine Corps is reverting to the old model rather than leaning into a new model that works based on the metrics measured. She wanted to know how the Service can publicly state that the integration worked but at the same time not move forward with more integration in recruit training. The Marine Corps briefer responded that the Service plans to integrate at least four and as many as eight companies in fiscal year (FY) 2020. The Marine Corps has increased the number of female recruits joining the Service, but there has not been a parallel increase in the structure to support women in training; therefore, the Service cannot integrate companies from June through September because of the large size of the recruit classes. Most recruits enter initial training from June through September because the majority join the Marine Corps out of high school. Integrated training will be held four times before June and maybe again at a later point in 2020. The plan is set by the

commanding officer at Parris Island. The briefer stated that young recruits will not know the difference regarding integration and described how the parents of recruits are usually more concerned about integration and what it means for their children. Recruit training is driven by the master projection model and the number of recruits the Marine Corps ships each month.

FLTCM (Ret.) JoAnn Ortloff asked about the Marine Corps female recruit training attrition rate of 13 percent; she asked what the attrition rate was for male recruits. The Marine Corps briefer responded that the male recruit attrition rate was approximately 12 percent, which had increased from 8–9 percent. He stated that the female attrition rate has always been approximately 13 percent. The Marine Corps briefer noted that the Service is struggling with suicide and suicidal ideation in recruit training and that most recruits presenting those issues are men. He said that if these recruits cannot handle the pressure of recruit training that it is not advisable to put them in the ranks.

Dr. Hunter asked the Marine Corps briefer whether he knew the attrition rate for men at Fort Benning given that he cited the female attrition rate at that location as 45 percent. The briefer replied that the male attrition rate was 13.2 percent. He said he sent his Sergeant Major to Fort Benning to assess its integrated training, and female Soldiers reported they did not like living in separate accommodations because they felt they were not being treated the same as male Soldiers. In their trip to Fort Benning, the Marine Corps briefer said attrition was high because women felt that they had to compete with their male counterparts from day one, which led to physical problems and attrition. In Marine Corps recruit training, each gender can come together as a team and support one another in the first 3 weeks, and then integration progresses as the training continues. By the time recruits reach their occupational specialty schools, they are integrated down to the squad level.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked the Marine Corps briefer whether he had compared the Marine's recruit training with the Navy's given that the Marine Corps works more closely with the Navy and that the Navy has gender-integrated bootcamp. The briefer noted that his team went to Naval Station Great Lakes and examined the model of Navy recruit training but found it hard to compare because the Navy is preparing recruits to manage and run ships, whereas the Marine Corps' focus is to go ashore and fight; each Service has a fundamentally different mission. He said that at the operational level, the team is the most important element. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff added that she was seeking not only the attrition rate but also any lessons learned from how Navy recruits are integrated from day one. The briefer did not have information available on the attrition rate for the Navy and said his team did not find the Navy recruit training a valuable comparison.

Col (Ret.) John Boggs was pleased to hear the Marine Corps will be integrating recruit training at least four times in FY 2020. He agreed with the briefer's earlier point about recruits needing to see women in leadership positions from the beginning of their training. Col (Ret.) Boggs asked whether drill instructor teams are integrated and whether they stay integrated throughout training. The Marine Corps briefer responded that the female drill instructors are in the 4th Battalion. The platoon drill instructors are with their platoons constantly, so the instructor is of the same sex as the members of his or her platoon. The briefer stated 30 percent of the training occurs in the squad bay, which can be conducted only by a drill instructor of the same sex as the recruits, as dictated by law. Sixty percent of the training is integrated for drill instructors. The briefer noted that at some levels, the Service is starting to use instructors who are of the opposite sex of the recruits. Col (Ret.) Boggs asked whether there were female drill instructors on staff in

the 1st, 2nd, or 3rd Battalions. The briefer responded that there are female drill instructors in those battalions at levels other than the platoon level as part of the integration effort. There are women on staff for male battalions specifically to show recruits female role models. The Marine Corps has increased its overall supervision of recruit training because it plays a central role for shaping Marines; the Service places special trust and confidence in its instructors to help its members set off in a positive direction.

Dr. Hunter asked at what point a male recruit is introduced to a female drill instructor in a formal leadership role at both San Diego and Parris Island given that there is no integration at the platoon level and that there are no female recruits in San Diego. She noted that the briefer stated integration would not happen in the June through September timeframe because of the large number of recruits. The Marine Corps briefer responded that staff are in fact integrated at both locations. He stated that there are facility limitations in San Diego because that depot is more than 100 years old. It cannot accommodate integration between June and September because its squad bays hold 45 recruits, whereas bays in other depots hold 95 recruits. The briefer said it is hard to say when male recruits first encounter a female instructor, but when recruits leave the company, there are women in the chain of command. As recruits, they continue to be exposed to women, but the first and most difficult phase occurs in the platoon as recruits begin their transition into becoming Marines. The briefer said this segregation at the platoon level benefits men more than women because men are easily distracted. He described a trip to Israel, where he witnessed an all-female surveillance team watching camera footage; the supervisor in that workspace told him women were more focused and better at serving in that role.

Ms. Janie Mines followed up on the Marine Corps briefer's visit to Navy's initial training. She recognized that the missions of the Navy and Marine Corps are different but felt that it was still possible to learn from their commonalities. For instance, Ms. Mines stated there is nothing that requires more integration than a ship alone at sea. She requested that the Marine Corps review integration in Navy initial entry training again to examine how integration and communication works in that environment, learning from the characteristics that are less mission-based. The briefer responded that the topic is always worth another look, and that is why the Marine Corps is preparing to undertake an independent study. The briefer said the Sergeant Major who worked for him and observed the Navy training is retired now, and he represented one person's view of the Navy's training and why it would not work for the Marine Corps. He said the independent study will allow the Marine Corps to see how other Services are doing and test whether it is right in its current approach. The Service believes its approach is the best model for initial training, but they want to ensure they are correct. The briefer cited the repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and the integration of women into combat roles as examples of policy changes that were thought to be problematic but did not cause any significant issues. The briefer credited the fact that young people are more open and accepting than previously assumed. The Marine Corps briefer also stated that not many women have availed themselves of the combat opportunities but that those who have are doing well.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger asked the briefer whether he could share more information about the forthcoming study, including its timeframe and start date. The briefer said he was unsure how long the study will take because the Marine Corps is still seeking a research team. The Service has developed a work statement and is advertising it. The priority is for the study to be independent, credible, and peer reviewed. The briefer said the study may inform the Marine Corps its recruit training approach is wrong, and the Service will accept that conclusion.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Jarisse Sanborn asked whether the study will incorporate potential culture changes around gender attitudes that will need to accompany training integration. The briefer said the Marine Corps will look at its model of recruit training through the study and see what produces the best results. He stated that the Service does have a cultural problem. The Marine Corps, and the Navy's Sea, Air, and Land Teams (SEALs), have the longest entry-level training pipeline, during which inculcating core values and building team cohesion is essential to combat success. He stated there are young leaders in the Marines and SEALs who are negative and pull people down. He noted the negative culture online, where individuals say things they would never say in person. The Marine Corps briefer provided an example of a segment on the ESPN cable channel, during which men read the comments made about female ESPN sportscasters to them, noting it was tremendously uncomfortable to witness the kinds of things people were willing to say online. Marines who make these comments online are not always aware of the second- and third-order effects of their actions.

Ms. Jacquelyn Hayes-Byrd asked whether the Marine Corps has seen any measurable changes or results from the integration of female drill instructors in the recruit training environment. The Marine Corps briefer responded that it is too early to tell. He posited that there may have been some shift, but the Marine Corps has also been stricter about releasing rather than warning individuals who engage in behavior that goes against the core values of the Service. The briefer could not disentangle the impact of the increase in the number of female drill instructors versus the lower tolerance for misbehavior in the training environment. It is an issue the Service wants to address, similar to alcoholism, drinking and driving, sexual harassment, sexual assault, and suicide. He mentioned that the rate of suicide had increased significantly in the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps briefer said there are young Marines who do not realize suicide is a permanent solution to a temporary problem; suicide is unrecoverable. He provided an example of a young Marine who experienced a breakup and immediately committed suicide. These are issues the Marine Corps will continue to work on.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Allyson Solomon asked for more information about the kind of training drill instructors receive given that they are an essential link between the Marine Corps and recruits. The Marine Corps briefer responded that drill instructors complete Drill Instructor School, which prepares them to execute the standard operating procedures. For example, during the fourth phase of recruit training, drill instructors hold role model discussions about Marine Corps core values, what they mean, why they are important, and how violating them is a breach of trust. Recruiters complete Recruiter School, which prepares them to hold similar discussions in addition to promoting the Marine Corps and engaging with families that include young adults who are interested in the Service. The briefer stated that the Commandant of the Marine Corps identified instructor and recruiter duty as two areas of risk for the Service because of the important roles instructors and recruiters play. If individuals in those positions have issues, it creates problems for the entire institution. The Marine Corps briefer concluded by stating perfectionism is not something that is attainable, but the institution strives for it and will not give up.

RADM (Ret.) Cari Thomas asked the Marine Corps briefer if there were constraints to upgrading facilities in San Diego and Parris Island to adequately integrate recruit training. The briefer responded that a planning team is conducting a study of the recruit depot in San Diego and assessing what facility changes are needed in San Diego and Parris Island. The briefer stated that the current number of female drill instructors is insufficient to support both sites' integration.

The Marine Corps is composed of only 8 percent women; therefore, there is a very small pool of women who can train to become a drill instructor. On the east coast, the challenge is to close the 4th Battalion and build new facilities to allow for integration.

Panel: Military Services' Maternity Uniform Update (RFI 6)

The Committee requested a briefing from each of the Military Services on policies, current initiatives to improve maternity uniforms, and recent changes to maternity uniforms. The Committee requested information on the following: (1) changes, initiatives, and improvements to maternity uniforms since the Committee was last briefed in September 2016; (2) how the Services measure the effectiveness and impact of changes to new uniforms; (3) findings from each Service's most recent maternity uniform wear test—specifically, the functionality, comfort, affordability, availability, and consistency with non-maternity uniforms; and (4) how the effectiveness of newly proposed uniforms was measured.

Army

The Army briefer stated his intention to present information to the Committee on how the Army is addressing issues related to maternity uniforms for Service members. He noted that the United States currently has between 1.1 and 1.2 million active-duty Service members and that 18 to 20 percent of those Service members are female. He noted that because the number of female Service members is so high, issues around maternity uniforms are important and should be taken seriously.

The briefer presented a photo of the old Army universal camouflage pattern maternity uniform design and said pregnant Service members found them uncomfortable and had a strong dislike for them. He said prior to 2 years ago there was no desire to change the design of the Army maternity uniform because it was difficult to identify ownership of the design. However, 2 years ago the Army agreed to address the issue of maternity uniforms, and the Service began working cooperatively with the Air Force and Coast Guard to develop new and improved maternity uniforms. He noted the Air Force led the testing of the newly designed maternity uniforms.

The Army briefer presented two photos of the newly designed Army operational camouflage pattern (OCP) maternity uniform and confirmed the Service has an adequate stock of the uniforms, which are being issued to pregnant Soldiers through Central Issue Facilities. He explained the newly designed maternity uniform features a belly panel that extends all the way around the top of the trousers, and confirmed that pregnant Airmen who tested the new uniform design found it so comfortable that they did not want to return the samples after testing was complete. Pregnant Airmen also found that they were able to wear the new maternity uniform through multiple trimesters because of the increased flexibility of the belly panel. The briefer explained that the improved Army maternity uniform options consist of a coat, undershirt, trousers, socks, boots, and headgear, and that the uniform is designed to visually match the Army's combat uniforms issued to all other Soldiers.

The briefer then presented a photo of the new design for the Army service maternity uniform. He explained the uniform options consist of a tunic, slacks, skirt, short- and long-sleeved shirts, and a necktab. Service members are required to purchase these uniforms.

The briefer then presented photos of the Army maternity nursing t-shirt and noted that Soldiers have the option to purchase the t-shirt to wear after they give birth and are lactating. He said the

t-shirt is available for Service members to purchase and authorized for female Soldiers to wear if they desire.

The briefer then explained the new Army culinary maternity uniform is similar to a professional chef's uniform and has options that consist of a white smock, black trousers, and tunic. He noted that the smock is adequately sized for pregnant Soldiers to wear on duty and that the slacks feature a stretch waistband to allow them to be comfortably worn. He confirmed that pregnant Soldiers are also authorized to wear commercial apparel, such as commercial black slacks, for military food service occupations.

The Army briefer explained that the Service approved the development and implementation of an Army physical fitness maternity uniform in summer 2019 for pregnant Soldiers who wish to participate in physical training. He noted that pregnant Soldiers will also have the option of wearing the uniform for medical appointments and that the uniform will be available for pregnant Soldiers to purchase as they progress through their pregnancy.

The briefer reiterated that the new Army OCP maternity uniform was developed in concert with the Air Force and Coast Guard, and the results from Air Force uniform testing were used for presentation to Army senior management to ensure their buy-in. He confirmed that the Army adopted the Air Force's new maternity uniform design December 21, 2018, but made a few changes, which included changing the collar and camouflage pattern to match the Army combat uniforms. He noted the Air Force has since adopted the Army OCP, Army combat uniform, and Army maternity uniform.

Navy

The Navy briefer presented photos featuring each of the Navy's current maternity uniforms. She confirmed Sailors will be authorized to wear the current Navy Working Uniform (NWU Type I) until September 30, 2019, after which they will be required to wear the new Navy working uniform (NWU Type III). She noted that two changes have been made to the Navy maternity uniforms since the last Committee briefing on maternity uniforms in September 2016: (1) the authorization for pregnant Service members to wear an optional nursing t-shirt with all working and Service maternity uniforms, and (2) enhancements to the design of the service and service dress white maternity top.

The briefer explained that the Navy measures the effectiveness and impact of changes to uniforms through fleet feedback provided through various mechanisms, including the Navy Uniform Matters Office email, which is reviewed daily; the MyNavy UNIFORMS Mobile Application; social media, including Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram; and the Navy Uniform Matters Office individual team member emails. She also explained that the Navy started a uniform grooming policy working group in August 2018, and the group is advertised to encourage participation from Service members of all pay grades and genders.

The Navy briefer explained that four colors of nursing t-shirts are authorized to be worn by lactating servicewomen with working and service uniforms: white, black, coyote brown, and blue. She noted that the nursing t-shirts feature a crewneck collar and are available with short or long sleeves and in sizes from small to extra-large. She also clarified that Service members are authorized to wear nursing t-shirts only in nonindustrial and non-afloat environments.

The briefer presented photos of the current and improved service dress white maternity top. She noted that the approved design enhancements include princess seams, pockets, adjustable side

tabs with three buttons, and the elimination of chest pockets with flaps. She mentioned that the projected availability of the enhanced Service dress white maternity top is calendar year 2020, at which point Sailors will be authorized to purchase the uniforms.

The Navy briefer also explained that the most recent wear test for Navy maternity uniforms was conducted in 2011 with the khaki maternity blouse. As a result of the study, she noted that the Navy implemented pattern adjustments, adjustable side tabs to accommodate desired appearance, side seam pockets to accommodate carrying small items, and length availability options to accommodate height and physical changes over the course of the pregnancy. She confirmed the khaki maternity blouses are available to Service members through some Navy Exchange Uniform stores and call centers as well as online. She noted Service members can have their measurements taken at the uniform shop and then purchase the uniforms online if they are unavailable at the Navy Exchange Uniform store. The briefer also noted user feedback is the best method for determining Service member satisfaction with the design of the maternity uniforms.

The Navy briefer then presented a photo highlighting enhancements made to the short-sleeved Service dress white maternity top. She mentioned the Navy added a cold weather maternity parka as a new outer garment for pregnant Service members in 2019.

Marine Corps

The Marine Corps briefer cited one challenge related to maternity uniforms specific to the Marine Corps: only 1.4 percent of the Service's population has been pregnant at any time. As a result, the Marine Corps addresses issues related to maternity uniforms by letting other Military Services research and develop improvements to the uniforms. She said the Marine Corps has followed the Air Force's and Army's lead in this area.

The briefer said the most common suggestion the Marine Corps has received from surveying Service members about the new maternity blue dress uniform is to add side tabs to the shirts and tunics to allow for a fitted look throughout the pregnancy. She presented photos of the Marine Corps combat utility maternity uniform and the maternity Service uniform to the Committee and noted the combat utility maternity uniform is available in desert and green variations. She also explained that the Service is in the process of certifying commercial nursing t-shirts for use with the combat utility maternity uniform and that she anticipated they will be approved in the near future and available for Marines to purchase as an optional garment. She also highlighted the available options for the maternity Service uniform, which include short- and long-sleeve shirts, a tunic, a skirt, and slacks. She explained that the maternity uniform is issued to eligible enlisted Marines at no cost through the Marine Corps Exchange but that officers are required to purchase the uniform.

The Marine Corps briefer also noted that there is Service-level interest in improving formal maternity uniforms, but the discussions are still in the preliminary stage, and research in this area has not yet begun.

Air Force

The Air Force briefer presented photos of all current Air Force maternity uniforms to the Committee. He noted the current maternity uniforms match the style of the non-maternity uniforms except for the Service dress jumper. He explained that the Service will transition from the current Airman battle maternity uniform to the operational camouflage pattern maternity uniform in October 2019 and that selected core sizes of the uniform will be available in uniform

shops for pregnant Airmen to try on but that the majority of the uniform sizes will be available online.

The briefer noted the most recent Air Force fit and wear tests were conducted with the Service dress maternity shirt. He confirmed the Air Force added features to the Service dress maternity shirt after testing, such as increased shirt length to improve coverage throughout the pregnancy. He said other Services were also looking to adopt these features.

The briefer also mentioned the Air Force Women's Initiative Team sent a survey to approximately 99,000 active duty and Reserve Airmen to gather feedback on maternity uniforms, and he confirmed the results from this survey should be available to the Air Force on September 23, 2019. He said the Service could share the results from the survey during a future DACOWITS quarterly business meeting.

Coast Guard

The Coast Guard briefer explained that the Service's Office of Military Uniforms manages standard issue uniforms and sea bag items. He reported that in 2016 the Coast Guard was in the process of revamping its operational dress maternity uniform in cooperation with the Air Force. As a result of this work the Coast Guard adopted the Air Force maternity battle uniform, which included design changes motivated by communications with Service members about the features they liked and disliked in maternity uniforms. He confirmed that the new Coast Guard maternity uniforms has been in production since March 2019 and that the feedback from Service members had been very favorable thus far.

The briefer explained how the Coast Guard partnered with the Navy to make small revisions to its maternity uniforms because of complaints from Service members prior to 2012. The Coast Guard then communicated with Service members to gather their feedback on the changes. Service members considered the half belly panel on the maternity trousers very uncomfortable; as a result it was replaced it with a full, 360-degree belly panel; the change has generated very positive feedback. In response to member feedback the Service also increased the size of the uniform sleeves. Most recently pockets were added back into the maternity uniform; pockets were eliminated in 2012 and 2013 design updates, but Service members did not respond favorably to this change. The briefer noted the Coast Guard has also added adjustable side tabs and increased the back length of the maternity blouse based on feedback from its members.

The briefer presented photos of the new operational dress maternity uniform to the Committee. He confirmed the member feedback on the new uniform has been very positive. He said that the Coast Guard will be transitioning to NWU Type III uniforms soon but that the maternity uniform will feature only minor visual modifications such as changes to patches placement and branding.

The Coast Guard briefer highlighted that Uniform Board 48 was convened in October 2018 as part of cross-Service discussions on uniforms. He confirmed the Service is considering developing its own nursing t-shirt, but in the interim, its members have been authorized to wear a commercial variant nursing t-shirt that meets certain specifications and can be purchased in most civilian stores. He also reported the Coast Guard Military Uniform Program is developing a standard maternity utility t-shirt with ruching to improve comfort and fit throughout the pregnancy and wants to partner with other Services on reviewing the maternity dress line. He confirmed the Coast Guard standard utility t-shirt is the same style and pattern as the Air Force's

t-shirt but is a different color, and the Air Force and Coast Guard design facilities will work together on the development of the standard maternity utility t-shirt.

The Coast Guard also wants to address issues with the maternity jumper; it has received strong negative feedback on that garment from pregnant Service members who want or need to wear a dress uniform for formal events. The briefer confirmed that the Coast Guard has discussed making modifications to the dress jacket but that the jacket is already expensive to produce, so updating the jacket for a temporary medical condition (pregnancy) will result in a higher cost to Service members.

Discussion

Ms. LeeAnne Linderman commended the briefers for their Services' collaborative efforts to improve maternity uniforms and said the collaborative approach to uniform development should be considered a best practice. She asked the Navy briefer how often female Service members have used the numerous uniform feedback mechanisms cited in the Navy briefing. The briefer said the Navy Uniform Matters Office has received four inquiries during the last 8 months about issues related to maternity uniforms. She said the feedback has come from senior enlisted Service members who are often voicing the opinions of more than one other Service member. She also reported receiving feedback during the Joint Women's Leadership Symposium about the sizes of maternity uniforms varying from those of the non-maternity Navy uniforms. Ms. Linderman suggested that when a Service offers its members many options for providing feedback, it can sometimes reduce the amount of feedback Service members provide. She reiterated her question and asked how many women have used the various uniform feedback mechanisms. The Navy briefer reported that across all the feedback mechanisms, the Navy Uniform Matters Office has received five instances of feedback, but she also mentioned that Navy commanders also receive uniform-related comments that are not always shared with the Navy Uniform Matters Office.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger noted that some of the briefers reported fielding surveys to gather representative feedback from Service members and asked if the Navy has conducted similar data collection activities. The Navy briefer said the last survey with information relevant to maternity uniforms was conducted in 2011.

Col (Ret.) Boggs referenced the Army briefer's comments about Soldiers responding favorably to updates made to the Army maternity uniforms but also noted the Committee received negative feedback from Service members about the uniforms during this year's focus groups, which included reports that the waistbands on the maternity trousers rolled up and cut into their skin, as well as concerns about the lack of pockets in the maternity uniform. He asked what positive feedback the Army has received regarding maternity uniform updates. The Army briefer responded that his office has not received any feedback on maternity uniforms to date but that the Sergeant Major of the Army surveys troops on occasion and in the future could potentially address the topic of feedback on maternity uniforms. He noted the Army utilized feedback collected by the Air Force during user evaluations with pregnant Airmen. He also explained that he has heard negative comments from Service members about the previous Army maternity uniform because the belly panel extended only halfway around the waist of the trousers, which caused it to roll down, but the panel in the new maternity uniform extends all the way around the waist and, therefore, should alleviate this issue. The Army briefer thanked Col (Ret.) Boggs for his comment and agreed to discuss with leadership strategies for obtaining feedback from

Soldiers on the new maternity uniforms. He also mentioned the Army plans to issue 750 maternity uniforms per month to accommodate approximately 5,400 Soldiers pregnant at one time. He said although the population of Soldiers pregnant at any one time is very small, it is important for the Army to better understand Service member opinions on the new maternity uniforms and what improvements can be made. Col (Ret.) Boggs thanked the Army briefer and reiterated his request that a feedback mechanism be developed to make the Army aware of maternity uniform-related issues before the Committee is.

Ms. Therese Hughes noted one theme consistently raised by enlisted Service members during this year's focus groups was the cost of uniforms. She explained her understanding from the Service briefings was that the Services provide work uniforms that can be used daily, but pregnant Service members sometimes need other uniforms for events, and the cost and availability of these uniforms is a challenge across all the Services. She said she understood that Service members share maternity uniforms as well but that the sharing of uniforms is not always an option on smaller installations. She asked how the Services plan to handle the issue of cost to Service members who have to purchase maternity uniforms. The Navy briefer noted that the Navy provides a clothing allowance for maternity uniforms to enlisted Sailors, and they are eligible for this allowance once every 36 months. She indicated that Service members can purchase one of each style of maternity uniform if that is required by the base command, but some base commands may not require pregnant Service members to purchase one of each uniform. In this situation, Service members can buy three working uniforms if they prefer. The briefer also confirmed that officers do not receive a uniform allowance for maternity uniforms. She said that concerns around the cost of maternity uniforms arise for enlisted Service members when they have back-to-back pregnancies because of the 36-month limitation on receiving the maternity uniform allowance. The Air Force briefer noted that the Air Force also provides a maternity uniform allowance to its members every 36 months. The Navy briefer explained Sailors receive an annual clothing allowance along with a maternity uniform allowance, and those with back-to-back pregnancies are authorized to use the annual clothing allowance to purchase maternity uniforms if preferred. The Coast Guard briefer confirmed the Coast Guard provides a maternity uniform allowance for its members once they become pregnant but mentioned that previously, members were required to use the allowance to purchase a predetermined set of maternity uniforms; as a result, petty officers in operational units had to purchase a dress uniform they would not use. He confirmed the Service has changed this policy to allow its pregnant members to purchase adequate uniforms for their current positions. He noted that members receive a maternity uniform allowance of approximately \$1,000 and can also use their annual clothing maintenance allowance for maternity uniforms if desired.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked the Navy briefer why nursing t-shirts can be worn only in nonindustrial and non-afloat environments. The Navy briefer indicated that because the nursing t-shirts are not made of 100 percent cotton, they are not authorized for those environments because of safety requirements. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked if the Navy could look into making 100 percent cotton nursing t-shirts available to Service members and authorize them to be worn in nonindustrial and non-afloat environments. The Navy briefer confirmed the Service can investigate that possibility but also indicated that Service members returning from maternity leave are not required to return to sea duty for 12 months after their return, although some choose to return sooner.

Dr. Hunter noted that multiple Service briefers referenced uniform boards and asked each Service how many women are on those boards. The Marine Corps brifer explained that there is only one female designated billet for the Marine Corps uniform board but that women can serve in other non-gender-designated positions on the board. She said the board is composed of students from Quantico, so it is able to bring in as many female Service members as needed when the board is more focused on discussions related to women-specific issues. The Navy brifer said the composition of the Navy uniform board is at least 50 percent female. She noted that one of the topics the uniform board will discuss during its next meeting is women's hair and grooming and that it will bring in more female Service members who have experience in this area to discuss the topic. The Army brifer said the present Army uniform board is composed of 17 members, with 3 positions designated for female Service members. He noted that women can also serve on the uniform board in positions outside of the three positions designated for female Service members. He said that as many as six women have served on the board at one time and that the goal is to ensure 18 to 20 percent of the board is composed of female Service members to match the population of the Army. The Air Force brifer noted that the Air Force tries to match the composition of the uniform board to the demographics of the Air Force population. The Coast Guard brifer said the Coast Guard uniform board is convened every 18 months and at times has had no female representation. He noted the uniform board has been reinvigorated after being inactive in 2017 with the added consideration to ensure it includes a diversity of Service members. At present there are 11 members on the board, including 10 voting members and the board president, who casts the tiebreaker vote if necessary. For the first iteration of the uniform board implemented in 2017, the board positions were tied to particular directorates associated with uniforms, such as health and safety, but this approach resulted in the board being composed of primarily senior men. However, the next iteration of the uniform board, convened in October 2018, addressed a variety of female-centric topics such as women's hair and uniforms and included four female board members. He said the Coast Guard is considering other ways to improve diversity on the board, including implementing female-designated positions specifically focused on mid-grade to senior Service members, as well as recruiting award-winning Service members ranging in rank from senior enlisted to officers. The brifer said the goal is to compose the uniform board of approximately half male and half female Service members, as well as half enlisted and half officer ranks.

CSM (Ret.) Michele Jones said during the focus groups, Service members expressed confusion about where to find maternity uniforms and when the maternity uniform will arrive after it is ordered. She also said it is important to consider the uniform distribution plan for Reserve and Guard members who do not live near a military installation and asked how the Services are addressing those needs. The Air Force brifer confirmed the Air Force looked into this issue after it was made aware some Reserve and Guard Airmen did not have access to maternity uniforms. He said maternity uniforms are normally issued to Reserve and Guard Airmen, but if they are unable to receive them within a certain timeframe, they can go to the Army and Air Force Exchange store and purchase the uniforms online as a last resort. CSM (Ret.) Jones asked if Service members would be reimbursed for this expense. The Air Force brifer was unsure about the reimbursement policy for that situation. The Navy brifer said that Navy Reserve and active duty enlisted Service members apply for the maternity uniform allowance once they become pregnant and that they are required to locate the uniforms to be purchased with the allowance. She noted that many Reserve Component members live in remote areas far away from Navy installations but that they are able to use the call centers to purchase maternity uniforms.

However, she mentioned that the Navy has been receiving feedback recently from Navy Exchange Service Command about shortages of certain sizes of maternity working uniforms. She believed the shortage should be remediated by October 2019. She said that if the Navy Exchange Service Command cannot find the appropriately sized maternity uniform for a pregnant Service member that the member is directed to reach out to the call center to ensure receipt of a maternity uniform as soon as possible. The Army briefer explained that the Army has a centralized facility in Kentucky that manages uniforms for all Reserve and Guard members. He noted that Reserve and Guard members in need of maternity uniforms must call the facility to request them and that the facility should be able to ship the uniform to them within 3 days. He agreed to look into how many maternity uniforms the Kentucky facility maintains in its inventory for Reserve and Guard members. The Marine Corps briefer noted that Reserve and Guard members in the Marine Corps have the option to purchase maternity uniforms from the Kentucky Logistics Operations Center. The Coast Guard briefer said that the Coast Guard has a uniform distribution center in New Jersey and that its Reserve and active duty members can purchase uniforms online or by telephone at this facility using a stipend provided by the Coast Guard.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff commended the Coast Guard for using female awardees as part of the uniform board. The Coast Guard briefer explained that the Service plans to include female awardees for the upcoming uniform board to be formed in spring 2020 but that it is still determining which award winners to include. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted that one potential pool of awardees includes those acknowledged by the Joint Women's Leadership Symposium each year. She also mentioned the feedback the Committee has received from Service members through focus groups is available in the annual focus group reports on the DACOWITS website.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas referenced the Navy's restrictions on environments in which female Service members can wear the approved nursing t-shirt and asked if the other Services have similar restrictions. The Army briefer explained that Service members are typically not deployed while they are postpartum and, therefore, would not require a fire-resistant t-shirt because they are not placed in those types of environments. The Marine Corps briefer said her Service is still in the process of certifying the nursing t-shirt and that she was unsure what fabric will be used. She noted that like the Army, the Marine Corps was unlikely to deploy a postpartum woman. The Air Force briefer said that he knew of no restrictions regarding the wearing of nursing t-shirts but that if there was a restriction he was unaware of, it would be as part of the flight uniform. The Coast Guard briefer confirmed that the Coast Guard provides a 100 percent cotton nursing t-shirt because it does not allow synthetic fabrics to be worn in environments where fire hazards may be present.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said the feedback DACOWITS received from focus groups with Service members this year contrasts with some of the information from today's briefings, but this difference highlights the improvements that have been made to the maternity uniforms that are starting to be fielded. She asked how the Services disseminate information to Service members about improvements made to maternity uniforms and when these improvements will be implemented. The Army briefer said that the Sergeant Major of the Army hosts a website through which information is disseminated and that he conducts town halls at different facilities, where he receives feedback from Service members on different issues; however, the briefer acknowledged the feedback is not always shared with his office in a timely manner. He recognized that Service member feedback on maternity uniforms received by the Army versus that received by DACOWITS is different and noted that Service members may not provide

honest information to Army leadership because they are too intimidated to share their opinions. He agreed to speak with senior leadership on this issue and suggest they revise the approach to receiving feedback from Service members to ensure the responses they receive are honest. The Navy briefer said the Navy Uniform Matters Office disseminates information regarding what the office is working on through quarterly newsletters. She explained that when she attended the Joint Women's Leadership Symposium that Service members said they were unaware of the quarterly newsletter that had been disseminated by the Navy Uniform Matters Office for the previous 2 years. She said the Navy needs a better way of capturing Service member feedback and sharing updates with Service members. The Air Force briefer said the Air Force uses public affairs channels and the Air Force Personnel Center to disseminate messaging. The Marine Corps briefer said she maintains a public website with information about Marine Corps uniform updates. She added the Service also disseminates uniform updates through social media and All Marine Corps Activities notifications. The Coast Guard briefer said the Coast Guard uses record message traffic to disseminate all official policy; information on updates to uniforms can also be disseminated through magazines and the Service's two media websites.

Col (Ret.) Boggs said Service members do not spend much time reading, so for instance when the Marine Corps wants to disseminate information, it should be provided to platoon leaders, who can further disseminate the information to platoons. The Marine Corps briefer responded by saying Service members read Twitter and use Google frequently. She said she also engages with every enlisted Service member class at Quantico and attends all symposiums on the east coast to engage Service members and disseminate information. The Navy briefer said the Navy focuses on videos and other visual aids to disseminate information. She added the Navy also sends out uniform tips to Service members weekly, and she has received positive feedback on that strategy.

DoD Family Advocacy Program: Addressing Domestic Abuse Panel (RFI 8)

The Committee requested a briefing from DoD regarding the collection of data related to domestic violence, including (1) the process of reviewing domestic violence data from each of the Military Services (to include the Reserve and Guard); (2) what analysis is conducted and who is the recipient of the data analysis; and (3) any corrective actions or initiatives that have been taken in the past 5 years or that are underway to protect domestic violence victims, to make it easier for servicewomen to report incidents, and to eliminate incidences across military communities.

Two briefers from the Office of Military Family Readiness Policy within the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Community and Family Policy briefed the Committee. The first Family Advocacy Program (FAP) briefer thanked the Committee for the opportunity to talk about family advocacy services. The briefer acknowledged both men and women experience abuse, but the briefers planned to use the presentation to highlight female victims in abusive relationships. The briefer noted that FAP was established more than 35 years ago. It first focused on investigating child abuse and now includes family advocacy. The program has increased its scope of services to include sexual behavior and youth in military families. The briefer said FAP alone cannot address family violence and abuse, which is why it works collaboratively with military installations, commands, schools, lawyers, child protective services, and other civilian services. FAP focuses on helping family members and commands to identify problems early on; the briefer said it is not uncommon for commands to identify family

problems. The briefer noted that early detection is key because there is a greater chance to resolve an issue and prevent violence in the future.

The briefer said FAP provides support through victim advocacy services and support from licensed clinicians for victims and offenders. Part of the challenge is to maintain victim safety. FAP is focused on victim support services and rehabilitation services for the offender and takes a systems-based approach.

The briefer referred to two terms commonly utilized by FAP: domestic violence and domestic abuse. Domestic abuse is defined as a pattern of behavior resulting in emotional/psychological abuse, economic control, and/or interference with personal liberty that is directed toward a person who is a current or former spouse, a person with whom the abuser shares a child in common, or a current or former intimate partner with whom the abuser shares or has shared a common domicile. The briefer said domestic abuse covers a broad category, which includes emotional abuse and physical abuse. Domestic abuse is not always classified as a crime. Domestic violence is defined as the use, attempted use, or threatened use of force or violence against a person, or a violation of a lawful order issued for the protection of a person who is a current or former spouse; a person with whom the abuser shares a child in common; or a current or former intimate partner with whom the abuser shares or has shared a common domicile. Acts of domestic violence are addressed under the United States Code, the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and/or State law, meaning that they can be treated as legal offenses.

The briefer said FAP receives referrals from a variety of services, including from concerned neighbors and friends. When an allegation is received, FAP has a reporting process in place with the military command and law enforcement. The briefer said the command can assist with creating a safety plan for the victim. When an incident is reported, information is gathered and is shared with FAP. The program is sanctioned to determine whether the incident meets DoD's definition of abuse. FAP can involve the medical command and obtain a social psychological assessment. The treatment plan is based on the social psychological assessment. Regardless of whether an incident meets the definition of domestic abuse, FAP can recommend a treatment plan based on the assessment. After the command is given information about the treatment plan, it can strongly encourage the offender to participate in treatment. The briefer noted some limitations to this approach. For example, sometimes the offender is not active duty or is a civilian, and the command has no authority over civilians. The briefer noted a victim can choose to file a restricted report and can obtain medical and FAP services without needing to notify law enforcement services.

The second briefer discussed the data available to FAP, including reports of domestic abuse incidents, information that is stored in the military service case management system and central registry, and unrestricted reports. The DoD central registry contains information on incidents of child abuse and neglect and domestic abuse. The central registry allows FAP to identify trends, develop changes in policy, and support changes in budgets. The registry tracks criteria but does not contain measures of accountability, command action, legal action, or information about restricted reports.

The second briefer said that most reports are made at the installation level and that FAP staff put information into the case management system. For some Services, the case management system is the same as the central registry, whereas for others, it is different. Each Service is responsible

for its own quality assurance process, and FAP members and their Service counterparts collaborate twice a year to discuss any data quality issues that emerge over time.

DoD produces an annual report on child abuse and neglect that details the types of domestic abuse incidents, number of reported incidents, number of incidents that met the criteria for domestic abuse, number of unique victims, number of spouse abuse incidents and victim rates, demographics of victims and offenders, domestic abuse fatalities, and a measure of offender treatment success. The analysis of data is primarily limited to descriptive statistics, including the test of statistical significance and rates of variance over time. The briefer noted that according to the FY 2018 report, out of nearly 17,000 reported incidents of domestic abuse, slightly more than half met DoD's clinical definition of abuse. Approximately three-quarters of the incidents were deemed physical abuse, and fewer than a quarter were deemed emotional abuse. A smaller proportion of incidents met the criteria for sexual abuse, and an even smaller percentage of incidents met the criteria for neglect. The report noted that rates of spousal abuse had been relatively stable during the past 10 years, as reported per 1,000 married couples. Intimate partner abuse statistics also stayed relatively the same over a 10-year period. FAP saw adult sexual abuse increase from 2009 to 2017 but decline in FY 2018. The briefer said the decrease in adult abuse cases was not statistically significant. In FY 2018, there were 15 domestic abuse fatalities; 13 involved domestic spouses, and 2 involved intimate partners. The second briefer said FAP collects other metrics in addition to elements that appear in annual reporting. For example, in FY 2018, FAP collected annual metrics on domestic victim advocacy and domestic abuse clinical treatment. These metrics are based on the number of abusive spouses who began and completed treatment and who did not have a reoccurring incident of abuse within the current reporting year. FAP staff established a working group to expand the number of metrics to be examined by the department; new metrics will be included in future data collections, including the total number of restricted reports.

The first briefer ended the presentation by discussing who FAP serves as well as ongoing and developing initiatives. The program serves spouses of active duty Service members, intimate partners of Service members, and Reservists who are activated under Title 10. If Reservists are not activated and seek FAP services, the program refers them to civilian support services. Some ongoing FAP initiatives include professionalizing victim advocates, ensuring that victim advocates receive certifications for their specialization, and DoD-wide victim advocate training. FAP is constantly working to improve communication with military families, especially very young families, through social media and electronic communications. FAP is collaborating with DoD's suicide prevention office to reduce the number of murder-suicides and homicides that are related to domestic violence. The briefer noted that FAP is working closely with the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement a victim advocate program in hopes of bridging the gap in services for those who are leaving the military. FAP is also focusing more on the use of technology in domestic abuse (i.e., cyber stalking).

Discussion

Ms. Hughes expressed appreciation for FAP's work. She posed a question about the trend of reported domestic abuse and spousal abuse rates remaining relatively level over the past 10 years. Ms. Hughes noted that this statistic may be an indicator that women are not reporting abuse. She inquired what was being done to help women report abuse and feel safer in their environments given that women may not want to report abuse for a variety of reasons. Briefer 1 responded that FAP has tried to engage with other parts of the community so that military

families are aware of FAP's services beyond just reporting abuse (e.g., stress management classes, parenting classes) so that when issues arise, military families view FAP as a comprehensive resource for more than just reporting abuse. The briefer said abuse victims often associate FAP with consequences for their military spouses. Over the years FAP has attempted to reinforce the message that it is part of the resources available to the broader military community. FAP has focused on networking in the community so it is better known as a resource for neighbors to use when someone is in trouble.

Col (Ret.) Boggs noted that domestic violence and abuse is a tough subject to address and thanked the panelists for their time. Col (Ret.) Boggs said during the presentation he took notice of the statistic that violence rates have stayed stable over the past 10 years and that he perceived this as an indication that current programs are not effective in preventing violence. He asked how the rate of violence can be decreased and whether FAP is focused on prevention. FAP briefer 1 also expressed concern that there has not been a decline in violence rates over the past decade. She said FAP is investigating several protective factors and working to further engage the community to build trust. The briefer said FAP is aware that families are a part of a larger community and are more likely to confide in one another. The briefer noted education is the issue and not the lack of availability of services. In an effort to increase availability, one Service has allowed access to FAP services for families that live off installation to reduce burden on those families. The briefer said FAP has focused on trying to educate and help families understand that the earlier they come in for services, the better their chances for stabilization and recovery.

Ms. Linderman followed up on Col (Ret.) Boggs' comment and asked whether the briefers could describe the type of training and education provided to leadership on how to identify the physical and behavioral signs of abuse. Briefer 1 responded that every commander who changes installations receives a training within 90 days of the transition. FAP expects commands to be trained on the dynamics of domestic abuse and to be aware that without intervention, abuse often becomes worse. The briefer added that although FAP has developed online training to educate leadership, there is not a mandate on how many or what types of trainings are required for command leadership surrounding abuse.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger informed the briefers the Committee received a related briefing from the Air Force that included dating partners as a category of intimate partners. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger asked the briefers whether FAP is considering embracing broader definitions of intimate partners. Briefer 1 said that FAP has not made such a policy change yet but that it considers the dynamics of the relationship and whether the victim and abuser are in an intimate relationship during the clinical assessment. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger asked the briefers to share more about any partnerships between FAP and military law enforcement. Briefer 1 mentioned a recent Inspectors General report that revealed how law enforcement responds differently to reported incidents of abuse that involve technology (e.g., sending threatening messages or location tracking). In some cases the alleged action against the victim was not treated as a chargeable offense, and once law enforcement left the scene, an incident of abuse occurred. The briefer noted there is an opportunity to intervene in these circumstances if FAP has a better understanding of incidents involving electronic communication. The briefer mentioned FAP is working to issue a Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) and hopes to have a policy in place within the next year.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn noted there is a persistent problem with accurately reporting incident numbers on base versus off base. She asked whether FAP was making any efforts to link off-installation and installation-based resources that families can utilize. Briefer 1 noted there are off-installation resources for military families (e.g., shelters, legal advocates); however, many victims choose to receive installation-based services because of the limited availability of off-installation resources. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn followed up by asking whether there was a way to identify the stress points most likely to trigger domestic abuse (e.g., the postdeployment period) and whether there were efforts in place to target prevention for those who are experiencing a high-stress period and might be more likely to engage in violent behavior. Briefer 1 responded that the literature has suggested that the time surrounding a deployment can be associated with a higher risk of domestic violence; however, the greatest stress occurs with a severe brain injury or other trauma.

Dr. Hunter inquired whether the measure of success for abusers extends beyond the 1-year timeframe and noted the briefing did not include a measure for victim reintegration. Briefer 2 replied that the offender abuse metric is very limited and is not longitudinal. FAP examines the offender's reported activity 1 year after an intervention. The briefer agreed with Dr. Hunter that this measure could be more robust; however, FAP would need to discuss this measure with other military counterparts to ensure it is included across reporting tools. She said the central registry includes only the 46 elements that are designated by policy and noted FAP does not report data at the individual victim level. Military installations have collected information about the services victims receive.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted the presentation did not include information surrounding prevention strategies and services (e.g., marriage retreats). She asked whether FAP has funding for prevention services and how it is utilized. Briefer 1 said FAP is centrally funded and provides funding to the Services for intervention and prevention services such as anger management, couples communication, chaplaincy services, and retreats. A prevention strategy plan went into effect 5 years ago. The briefer said DoD uses consistent language that has included a digital campaign. The briefer described a campaign conducted during the past 2 years that asked, "What is abuse?" and encouraged community members to self-evaluate how they defined abuse. The briefer noted FAP does not dictate to the Services what prevention services they should provide but does require all prevention programs to be effective and evidence-based. The briefer said FAP recently hired someone to monitor these programs.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger asked for more details on the 24/7 hotline mentioned during the presentation. Briefer 1 explained that the hotline is available 24 hours per day and that victims can obtain a victim advocate's cell phone number to call at any point in the day by logging into the Military OneSource website and providing their location. Callers previously had to leave a voicemail.

Ms. Hughes noted that although half of the incidents reported fulfilled DoD's definition of abuse, the other half still need to be addressed. Briefer 1 said because of the structure of the military, command support is important in helping to address family issues before they rise to the level of abuse. The briefer said commands are working in collaboration with FAP to provide and refer families to services and are more likely now to reach out to FAP to provide resources. FAP has continued to stress that all members share a responsibility in addressing domestic abuse.

CAPT (Ret.) Kenneth Barrett asked how many of the 9,000 reported cases were restricted cases. Briefer 2 said none were restricted. The briefer provided more clarity surrounding reporting limitations by sharing that FAP treatments and services are not mandatory, so only those who decide to enter treatment can be tracked as having successfully completed treatment and not being involved in a future incident. The briefer said in some cases, the command may be able to require treatment of a Service member, but this does not apply to civilian spouses.

LTG (Ret.) Kevin Mangum commented that it is incredibly important for commanders to receive family advocacy training. He recommended that noncommissioned officers (NCOs) also receive this training. Briefer 1 said that NCOs are also supposed to receive training but that FAP cannot mandate the amount of training required. LTG (Ret.) Mangum asked whether FAP services are available only to intimate partners who are active duty. Briefer 1 responded that because treatment is administered in the Services' facilities, one must be a Service member or dependent to receive treatment.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon asked the briefer to further clarify what is meant by "unique victims" and followed up on LTG (Ret.) Mangum's question by stating that activated Guard members should be eligible for services as well. Briefer 2 responded that activated Service members (including Guard members) are eligible for installation-based FAP services. The briefer said the term "unique victims" is most applicable to child abuse and neglect data but generally refers to the number of individuals who received FAP services. FAP tracks each incident, and a victim can appear in the database more than once if the same person is connected with two events on separate dates. FAP provides statistics on the number of reports versus number of incidents. The briefer said FAP wants to know how many unique individuals are represented in the data.

Public Comment Period

No public comments were provided for the September 2019 business meeting.

COL Davis concluded the public portion of the meeting for the day.

18 September 2019

Welcome and Opening Remarks

COL Davis, DACOWITS Military Director and Designated Federal Officer, began the second day of the September quarterly business meeting by reviewing the Committee's establishment and charter. COL Davis reminded those in attendance that any comments made during the meeting by Committee members are their personal opinions and do not reflect a DACOWITS or Department of Defense position. COL Davis then turned the meeting over to Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger, DACOWITS Chair.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked all Committee members and meeting attendees to introduce themselves.

2019 Propose and Vote on Recommendations

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger began the voting session by stating the importance of the Committee's recommendations. Since 1951, the Committee has submitted 1,022 recommendations to the Secretary of Defense. Of those recommendations, approximately 98 percent have been either fully or partially implemented by the Department. Committee members discussed and voted on the following recommendations and continuing concerns.

A. Gender Bias

The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that defines and provides guidance to eliminate conscious and unconscious gender bias.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation. Col (Ret.) Boggs seconded the motion.

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that defines and provides guidance to eliminate conscious and unconscious gender bias.*

B. U.S. Coast Guard Retention Study

The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to review the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Improving Gender Diversity in the U.S. Coast Guard: Identifying Barriers to Female Retention study and implement the relevant findings for improving female retention in their respective Services.

MAJ (Ret.) Priscilla Locke moved to adopt the recommendation. CAPT (Ret.) Barrett seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Dr. Hunter acknowledged several Services are conducting or plan to conduct their own research on retention and asked how those efforts relate to the recommendation. RADM (Ret.) Thomas explained the recommendation was not intended to supersede the Services' efforts but rather to draw attention to the Coast Guard's study at the highest levels of the Department.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said the current draft of the reasoning did not acknowledge ongoing or planned retention-related research by the Services. Dr. Hunter responded that in the Services' gender-integration implementation plans the Committee received in response to a September RFI, at least one Service described plans to conduct in-depth research into retention. Dr. Hunter voiced her concern about directing the Services to use findings from a different Federal Department and suggested softening the proposed language of the recommendation. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger suggested the Committee review those RFI responses to make sure the reasoning includes mention of those planned studies. Given that this has been a long-standing issue for the Committee, she believed that anything the Services could do to move the issue forward would be helpful. Dr. Hunter agreed.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to review the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Improving Gender Diversity in the U.S. Coast Guard: Identifying Barriers to Female Retention study and implement the relevant findings for improving female retention in their respective Services.*

C. Female Retention

The Secretary of Defense should require the Military Services to annually report current progress and initiatives to increase senior female representation as a part of the Total Force, at the E-9 and O-7 and above grade levels, with an additional emphasis on increasing racial and ethnic diversity at these levels.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon moved to adopt the recommendation. MAJ (Ret.) Locke seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Dr. Hunter said the wording of the recommendation can be shortened to focus on a report on progress and initiatives to increase diversity in senior female representation at the highest grade levels. She said the Committee is asking for two things in the recommendation: a report on current progress, and for DoD to adopt new initiatives. She said including the clause about increasing racial and ethnic diversity may not be necessary. In response, CAPT (Ret.) Barrett said in reviewing the data, the subcommittee

found glaring disparities in racial and ethnic diversity. He acknowledged there may be alternative ways to word the recommendation.

MAJ (Ret.) Locke said given that women make up 51 percent of the population, women's representation in the military needs to align. Dr. Hunter agreed but felt the recommendation focused too much on current initiatives that she believed were not leading to a diverse force. She said the recommendation addressed two different issues. Col (Ret.) Boggs agreed with Dr. Hunter, felt the recommendation focused on two separate issues, and questioned whether there was a better way to word the recommendation. MAJ (Ret.) Locke said she was open to suggestions and acknowledged the subcommittee struggled with the wording. She said increasing diversity was an urgent issue. Col (Ret.) Boggs questioned whether this should be one recommendation or two. Dr. Hunter said the wording around the initiatives to increase senior female representation ensures the emphasis of the recommendation is on racial minorities. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said that the recommendation should include both elements and that it would not be possible to remove the overarching focus on gender integration.

Dr. Hunter suggested revised wording that would require the Military Services to ensure their initiatives increase senior representation as part of the total force, including an emphasis on increasing racial and ethnic diversity. She said that the Services are already reporting on these issues and that the data already exist. DACOWITS wants the Services to ensure their initiatives include a focus on minorities. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said the suggested wording presumes initiatives are already in place to increase representation. Dr. Hunter said before the Committee asks the Services to report on progress, it should ask them to create the policies to increase diversity.

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett said DACOWITS received data from all the Services on their gender integration plans; some included concrete efforts to increase diversity, whereas others did not. Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon said it was unclear whether initiatives were in place in every Service, and if so, what the initiatives included. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked whether DACOWITS should just use "identify" in the recommendation or ask that the Services report current progress and identify initiatives. MAJ (Ret.) Locke suggested adding "significantly improve the initiatives." FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff was concerned some Services have initiatives in place and others do not. The recommendation should require the Services to identify their initiatives. CAPT (Ret.) Barrett asked whether the recommendation should ask the Services specifically about new initiatives. RADM (Ret.) Thomas proposed adding "identify" before "initiatives."

Dr. Hunter said the recommendation should be split into two separate recommendations. The first would ask the Services to report on existing initiatives, and the second would ask them to create initiatives that include an emphasis on increasing diversity at the most senior levels. She said that the data show there is a problem but that it is unclear whether initiatives exist, or existing initiatives are not working, or too little time has passed to implement the initiatives. LTG (Ret.) Mangum agreed the recommendation addresses two separate issues. He said the Army reports female general officer representation and believed the other Services do as well. The Services need to overcome many barriers to increase racial and ethnic diversity. He also explained that promotion boards are dictated by statute and that commands rely on these policies when making decisions about

promotions. Identifying individuals that are qualified to compete becomes the main issue, which is separate from the reporting aspect of the recommendation.

CSM (Ret.) Jones said the term “initiative” implies the Services are at the beginning of implementing something or that they have not started yet but have a projected start date or plan in place. She said if initiatives exist, they should be acknowledged. It is critical to identify whether there are initiatives that are beginning and that can be reviewed or adjusted. Some Services have efforts to increase racial and ethnic diversity in place and others do not.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked whether the existing Service initiatives are listed in the draft reasoning. MAJ (Ret.) Locke said they were not.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff said she did not view the two concepts as separate recommendations but agreed the wording was confusing. She suggested revising the recommendation to read, “The Secretary of Defense should require the Military Services to annually report current and proposed initiatives and their progress to increase senior female representation at the E-9 and O-7 and above grade levels to include increasing racial and ethnic diversity at these levels.” Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said that in the past, DACOWITS avoided requesting reports as part of the recommendations, given that the Committee can request reports at any time as part of the RFI process. She suggested the recommendation focus on directing the Military Services to implement initiatives rather than annually report. Dr. Hunter suggested the wording focus on asking the Services to create and implement initiatives, which addresses future and proposed activities.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested revising the recommendation to read, “The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to develop and implement initiatives to increase senior female representation as part of the total force at E-9 and O-7 and above grade levels to include an emphasis on increasing racial and ethnic diversity at these levels.” MAJ (Ret.) Locke said the proposed new wording addresses the confusion. One of the primary issues is that there is low or no representation of racial and ethnic minority women at the highest ranks in the military, and the recommendation is designed to address that. RADM (Ret.) Thomas said the recommendation was initially intended to focus on racial and ethnic diversity and the lack of representation. As the subcommittee progressed, its members did not want to lose focus on the lack of representation of women overall. Regarding the reporting aspect of the recommendation, it was intended to increase the Secretary of Defense’s awareness of the issue.

Dr. Hunter said the wording should address strategic-level oversight, not just reporting. Ms. Hughes said the most important thing is to increase racial and ethnic diversity at the E9 and O7 levels and above and suggested moving the wording to the beginning of the recommendation to increase the emphasis on that aspect of the recommendation. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff said she understood that point but offered that the primary focus is female representation, and the second is including racial and ethnic diversity. She said the term “to include” was stronger than “with an additional emphasis.”

MAJ (Ret.) Locke said that in reviewing the data, it was clear that something is broken regarding the representation of women overall and that if it is not fixed, there is no pathway to increase racial and ethnic diversity among women.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff moved to amend the recommendation to read, “The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to develop and implement initiatives to increase senior female representation as part of the Total Force at the E9 and O7 and above grade levels to include emphasis on increasing racial and ethnic diversity at these levels.” Dr. Hunter seconded the motion.

Discussion on Amendment: No discussion.

Vote on Amendment: The Committee voted to adopt the amendment unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Dr. Hunter moved to adopt the amended recommendation. MAJ (Ret.) Locke seconded the motion.

Vote on Amended Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the amended recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to develop and implement initiatives to increase senior female representation as part of the Total Force at the E-9 and O-7 and above grade levels to include emphasis on increasing racial and ethnic diversity at these levels.*

D. Body Fat Composition

The Secretary of Defense should conduct a comprehensive, scientific review of height and weight standards as well as body fat measurement techniques and use the findings as a baseline for setting a Department-wide standard for measurement and acceptable levels.

Dr. Hunter moved to adopt the recommendation. LTG (Ret.) Mangum seconded the motion.

Discussion:

RADM (Ret.) Thomas inquired whether she understood the phrasing of the recommendation correctly. She asked whether the subcommittee was recommending individual Service minimums or a DoD-wide minimum and whether subsequently, each Service would make adjustments to their own requirements.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff clarified that the DoDI already sets a minimum. She said the subcommittee recommends the proposed minimum be based on current research and a scientific review of literature. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted the Committee is not suggesting all the Services should be mandated to have the same requirements.

Dr. Hunter added that one should also consider that the standards align with current scientific research regarding physiological gender differences.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon noted she did not see any of the citations in the draft reasoning for the recommendation. Dr. Hunter responded that the citations had been in the reasoning text but that a formatting error inadvertently caused them to be deleted.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should conduct a comprehensive, scientific review of height and weight standards as well as body fat measurement techniques and use the findings as a baseline for setting a Department-wide standard for measurement and acceptable levels.*

E. Physical Assessment Criteria

The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to implement a holistic, preventative health screening, conducted by medical professionals, as part of the overall physical fitness assessment and provide access to uniform and consistent health and nutritional counseling as part of their physical fitness program.

Dr. Hunter moved to adopt the recommendation. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon inquired whether the subcommittee considered the impact of the Defense Health Agency realignment earlier in 2019 and the potential impact that would have on the Services' ability to continue to do to any kind of health assessment.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff responded that there was no impact from combining health services into one agency. She said she spoke with the director of the Defense Health Agency 2 months ago at a symposium and learned that as the Services realign, they will still be able to conduct the health assessments and screenings. She said that the most significant change would be in the name of the agency and that medical professionals would continue to be able to conduct the screenings.

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett asked whether there was a particular women's health issue the subcommittee was examining with this recommendation. Dr. Hunter replied that the focus is the health of women in their 20s because they do not present health issues in the same manner men do. Men's health issues are more likely to present when they are running or doing other cardiovascular activity, but women's health issues do not present as much during physical exercise. This is why the Committee recommends that DoD implement an assessment that is holistic and incorporates preventative health and aligns with the DoDI that mandates the Services assess the overall health of the Service member.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to implement a holistic, preventative health screening, conducted by medical professionals, as part of the overall physical fitness assessment and provide access to uniform and consistent health and nutritional counseling as part of their physical fitness programs.*

F. Physical Fitness

The Secretary of Defense should publish a standard statement to clarify the difference between the purposes of the general physical fitness test (to assess the overall fitness of Service members) and occupational physical testing (to assess a Service member's fitness for a particular career field).

Dr. Hunter moved to adopt the recommendation. LTG (Ret.) Mangum seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn made a point of order that the recommendation was read differently than it appeared on the screen. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger noted a point of order does not need to be voted on.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas asked what outcome the subcommittee intends to achieve with this recommendation. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff responded that the desired outcome is to clarify the difference between fitness testing and occupational standards for both Service members and the public. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted that there has been discussion among Service members about standards being lowered for women in combat roles and that this belief is spurred by misinformation. This recommendation should help resolve the confusion. Dr. Hunter noted that during several focus group discussions, the Committee learned some Service members believed that when integrating women into certain positions, the standards were being lowered. This recommendation could reduce biases that exist and clearly delineate the definitions for the physical fitness assessment from the requirements for a job.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn asked whether the problem was lack of explanation, definition, or distinction in existing policy or policies or that the policies exist but there is a lack of understanding among Service members.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted that the only distinction in the DoDI is that the Services must have separate tests for physical standards and occupational standards, but the subcommittee did not find any definitions that further distinguished between the two. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted that the focus groups revealed participants' confusion between the two tests and that Service members could not distinguish the components of the physical fitness tests from those for occupational standards. Dr. Hunter added that the subcommittee is seeking clarity. There is not consistent language among the Services that

distinguishes between the two tests. The subcommittee is addressing this because, prior to women being introduced into combat positions, there were no occupational standards for infantry, armor, and other combat positions. The new standards have been confused with the gender- and age-normed physical fitness standards.

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett said the subcommittee's recommendation does not address the scope of the issue and that the true issue is the public's misperception that women need lower standards. CAPT (Ret.) Barrett asked whether the subcommittee thinks it is addressing this issue with the recommendation. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted that addressing public misperception is one of the primary intents of the recommendation but that it is not the only intent. She said the Committee could clarify the wording.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum commented that nowhere in the DoDI does it state that tests are to be used for promotion; however, they are utilized in that way. There is a secondary outcome that women are being disadvantaged by gender-neutral standards. He suggested rewording to ensure gender bias is not present.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn asked whether the subcommittee's intent is to educate people about the differences between the physical fitness assessment and occupational testing. Dr. Hunter replied that the first step is to ensure assessments are consistently used across the Services (e.g., for promotions, screenings) and publish a standard definition. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff added that as the subcommittee members reviewed the DoDI, they found it outdated and confusing, so it is likely also confusing for Service members and the public.

Dr. Hunter agreed but suggested adding wording that would "direct the Services to" take action.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said if the recommendation aims to create policy, then the message may not reach Service members because there is the potential for it to be buried in a document rather than being communicated directly to the military. MAJ (Ret.) Locke added that every year during the DACOWITS focus groups, Committee members have learned about the lack of education surrounding standards, which she believes this recommendation addresses.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger suggested using "publish and disseminate" in the recommendation. Ms. Hughes suggested using "marketing" and disseminate" because marketing implies going out and educating people. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger noted marketing is not a term the military community typically uses when communicating with Service members.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested it may be helpful to include "standards" and "purpose" in the recommendation. Dr. Hunter noted the subcommittee had a similar discussion and discussed whether implementing a policy versus a standard would have more influence on educating Service members. She suggested using "publish and disseminate a standard" in the recommendation.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum urged the group to consider that there is a stated purpose of the test already listed in the DoDI and that the recommendation should be to clarify the general purpose and use of the general fitness test and occupational fitness test. Dr. Hunter suggested the Committee use language such as "purpose and uses" to speak to LTG (Ret.) Mangum's point.

Dr. Hunter noted that the Committee has already received information from the Services on how the tests are used and that if the Committee recommends a standard or use for one test, it will then have to recommend one for the other test.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff motioned to amend the recommendation to read, “The Secretary of Defense should publish and disseminate a standard statement to clarify the difference between the purpose and uses of the general physical fitness test (to assess the overall fitness of Service members) and the purpose and uses of occupational testing (to assess a Service member’s fitness for a particular career).” Dr. Hunter seconded the motion.

Discussion on Amendment:

Dr. Hunter suggested the text in parenthesis should be deleted. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff agreed with this suggestion and recommended the Committee add “overall use.”

RADM (Ret.) Thomas noted the text in the parentheses provides helpful context so that people who are reading the recommendations do not have to read the full reasoning to understand the purposes of the tests. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff agreed and said the recommendation should be able to stand alone without requiring one to read the reasoning to understand it.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff rescinded her original amendment, and Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger approved.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff moved to amend the recommendation to read, “The Secretary of Defense should publish and disseminate a standard statement to clarify the difference between the purpose and uses of the general physical fitness test (overall fitness) and the purpose and uses of the occupational physical testing (fitness for a particular career field).” Dr. Hunter seconded the motion.

Vote on Amendment: The Committee voted to adopt the amendment unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Discussion on Amended Recommendation: No discussion.

Vote on Amended Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should publish and disseminate a standard statement to clarify the difference between the purpose and uses of the general physical fitness test (overall fitness) and the purpose and uses of the occupational physical testing (fitness for a particular career field).*

G. Women in Ships

The Secretary of Defense should establish strategic level oversight within the Navy and Marine Corps to maximize opportunities for women to serve on ships while meeting strategic Service needs.

Dr. Hunter moved to adopt the recommendation. RADM (Ret.) Thomas seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Ms. Mines made a general statement about the proposed recommendation. She said that it was hard to disagree with the recommendation but that she felt the primary concern was berthing space availability. Ms. Mines felt it would be more accurate to include a statement at the end of the recommendation to emphasize berthing availability, but if the Committee included such a statement, she was not sure the recommendation would meet the strategic-level to be reviewed by the Secretary of Defense. Currently commands are responsible for determining the berthing assignments, and she questioned whether the data the Committee received can support the recommendation and worried whether there may be unintended consequences. Ms. Mines felt that there may be more work to do on this issue and that it may need to be a continuing concern rather than a recommendation. She stated that although the Navy had answered all the questions the Committee asked, it left other questions open in the process. For instance, the Navy did not indicate how many women applied for positions on ships, which would add contextual information. Ms. Mines stated she would like to obtain more follow-up information.

Dr. Hunter responded that the subcommittee has had extended discussions about this topic and that she feels that it should remain a recommendation for the Committee to obtain the needed Service-wide information. Dr. Hunter stated that the number of women unable to find placements on ships has doubled from year to year but that the number of women in the Service has not doubled during that time. She also commented that there are disparities in rack allocation on individual ships, which may be linked with individual bias dictating the rack availability process. Setting the focus at the strategic-level will allow the Committee to assess the issue more broadly and will push gender integration to happen in a more meaningful way, Dr. Hunter said. Right now women's access to ships is occurring at the tactical level, but ship commanders have many other things to concern them.

Ms. Mines responded that the lack of availability for women did not double every year; this increased seemed to be an anomaly. Ms. Mines shared that her experience has been that commanding officers have received pushback regarding their responsibility for gender allocation on ships but that they do not have the authority to execute what they want to do. Ms. Mines felt there needs to be more information collected before making a recommendation that takes the responsibility away from commanding officers.

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett asked whether the subcommittee has had a chance to review the information in RFI 1 (for the September quarterly business meeting), which outlined the Navy's direct actions for women at sea with the goal of all gender-neutral berthing by 2025. He reiterated that this does not contradict the recommendation's focus on the strategic-level but added that the Navy seems to be making progress in this area. CAPT

(Ret.) Barrett also commented that there was a lot of information in the Committee's reasoning draft about the Mineman rating, which he noted was a niche, small community. CAPT (Ret.) Barrett wanted to ensure that the subcommittee included information on other ratings to show the robustness of the issue.

Dr. Hunter responded that establishing strategic oversight was not synonymous with removing decisional authority from commanding officers. The ship's commanding officer will still have the ability to make decisions affecting the ship, but the strategic oversight will help ensure those decisions are aligned with a higher strategic purpose with centralized tracking. In response to CAPT (Ret.) Barrett's comment about Mineman, Dr. Hunter acknowledged it is a small rating, but when several minesweepers were kept from decommissioning longer than planned, there was a large increase in attrition in that community, which could have been because women were not able to spend time at sea. She referred to the Coast Guard's 2019 study on improving its gender diversity (mentioned earlier), which identified how real and perceived lack of opportunities for women to serve on ships affected retention.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff stated that for the Navy, the commanding officer and command master chief decide how to allocate berthing space. She expressed concern that this makes it easier for ship's leadership to reduce the size of women's berthing spaces. She provided an example of how it can be difficult for leadership to reconfigure gendered berthing spaces and worried that incoming leadership will follow the precedent of previous ship leadership's berthing arrangements. Strategic-level oversight could help to identify the decline across ships or platforms instead of leaving it up to individual commanders who have the limited view of how this issue is being handled on their ships.

Ms. Mines expressed reservations about the information the Committee had gathered so far and said she was concerned it had not received enough data. She provided the example that there was only one Mineman during a 3-year period who was unable to go to sea, but for hospital services, there were more. Ms. Mines added that the attrition rate for the Mineman rating in 2018 was 0 percent, which she emphasized is information that cannot be ignored when talking about this issue. Ms. Mines said this recommendation is a decision that is looking for a justification rather than a justification that builds to a decision.

Dr. Hunter responded that although numbers are part of the justification for the recommendation, there are other factors as well. She stated that a period of large attrition could be related to when there were minesweeper ships that were supposed to be decommissioned but remained online; as a result women now are not receiving the opportunity to do sea tours. Dr. Hunter stated that the information provided by the Services shows that there is not any strategic oversight and that commanders are basing their staffing decisions on what their previous commanders did. There are changes to the demographics of the force, but there is not a level of oversight to align with those shifts. Dr. Hunter stated that the subcommittee can deemphasize the Mineman rating in the reasoning but that this was the information that became the impetus for this line of inquiry. The strategic oversight would provide a big-picture view of the fleet, providing vision beyond what commanders see. She also pointed out that the number of women joining the Services continues to increase but the number retained continues to drop, and noted that sea time is essential for promotion in the Navy and Marine Corps.

MAJ (Ret.) Locke asked whether there was information in the reasoning on the Navy's 2025 goals that CAPT (Ret.) Barrett mentioned earlier, and Dr. Hunter confirmed that information was included in the reasoning.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff commented that another concern is that the Navy provided data only for surface ships. The Committee had to ask for information on carriers, military sealift command ships, and patrol crafts. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff stated there is no strategic oversight for all platforms to ensure there is not a reduction or fluctuation in availability for women without justification. She posited that the large gap in berthing exists because these decisions are being made locally or at the ship level with no strategic vision of the entire at-sea program.

Col (Ret.) Boggs asked whether the new ships that are being built are gender neutral and whether this issue will resolve itself over time. Dr. Hunter responded that gender-neutral ships will still leave the staffing decision at the level of the commander. Gender-neutral ships can be used in a truly gender-neutral way, but the continued precedence of berthing configuration can still be passed down among the leadership. She cited how commanders of the new Littoral Combat Ships said they did not want to include women purposefully because it was easier to exclude them altogether. CAPT (Ret.) Barrett stated that based upon his reading of the responses to RFI 1 (for the September quarterly business meeting), it appears the Navy is required to have 20 percent women on each ship. Dr. Hunter responded that the 20-percent representation is a goal the Navy is working toward, not a current requirement. She added that there was no enforcement of that requirement because there is no strategic oversight.

MAJ (Ret.) Locke requested clarification about whether the Navy's 2025 gender-neutral berthing goal includes destroyers and cruisers. Dr. Hunter responded that it does as long as the ships are delivered on schedule. She added that strategic oversight is even more important with gender-neutral ships because they could theoretically hold all-male or all-female crews; the ships could be configured in any way. Currently the Committee is working to obtain diagrams of these ships to have more information on possible configurations. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff provided an example of how current ship berthing configurations are determined by the ship's commanding officer and command master chief according to the number of men and women aboard and the number of berthing spaces.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation.

- Favored: 13 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 1 (Mines)
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should establish strategic-level oversight within the Navy and Marine Corps to maximize opportunities for women to serve on ships while meeting strategic Service needs.*

H. Continuing Concern: Marine Corps Recruit Training

Dr. Hunter moved to adopt the continuing concern. LTG (Ret.) Mangum seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Ms. Mines asked whether the wording of the continuing concern could be more specific. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said the Committee typically only lists the topic for a continuing concern. However, the reasoning can identify some of the areas that the Committee is interested in researching and reviewing.

Vote on Continuing Concern: The Committee voted to adopt the continuing concern unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

I. Breastfeeding and Lactation

The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that standardizes the requirements for and mandates the Military Services to inspect lactation rooms to ensure they are suitable, accessible, private, and clean for nursing servicewomen.

Ms. Linderman moved to adopt the recommendation. Ms. Hughes seconded the motion.

Discussion:

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked whether the subcommittee considered adding language to the recommendation that directs the Military Services to review options other than lactation rooms, such as mobile lactation units. She explained that during this year's installation visits, installation leadership often said that they did not have rooms available to designate as lactation rooms and that leaders were unaware of the mobile lactation unit option. Ms. Linderman noted that the subcommittee did not ask the Services to consider mobile lactation rooms in the recommendation but did reference the Friendly Airports for Mothers Act, and Walmart's initiative to add mobile lactation units to some stores in the reasoning. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked whether in addition to establishing standards for lactation rooms and mandating inspections, the subcommittee considered tying the recommendation to a unit's medical awards. Ms. Linderman confirmed that medical awards are referenced in the reasoning and described as a best practice being implemented by the Navy.

MAJ (Ret.) Locke noted that there are some installations with no lactation rooms. She suggested that DoD policy should mandate the Military Services to provide and inspect lactation rooms. Dr. Hunter confirmed there is a requirement for the Military Services to provide lactation rooms but noted the Committee heard a variety of reasons why installations were unable to provide them. She suggested the recommendation address not only the inspection of lactation rooms but also compliance with the DoD policy to ensure Service members have access to them. LTG (Ret.) Mangum said the wording of the recommendation is unclear; it could refer to establishing requirements for lactation room

inspections, but also requirements for the lactation rooms themselves. CSM (Ret.) Jones noted that based on feedback from Service members during the Committees' focus groups, some units did a good job meeting the requirements of ensuring lactation rooms are suitable, accessible, private, and clean; however, these requirements do not mandate any specific inspections of lactation rooms. She said that the recommendation could ask that clearer requirements for lactation rooms be established and that lactation rooms be inspected to ensure they meet those requirements. Dr. Hunter agreed that the recommendation should be stronger in addressing the establishment of requirements, how they are implemented, and how they are inspected.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon asked whether there is a DoD policy that mandates the Military Services to make lactation rooms available to servicewomen on all installations. Col (Ret.) Boggs responded that each of the Services has a policy on lactation rooms but that the requirements are not standardized, and based on feedback from the focus groups, some members are not aware of their respective Services' lactation room policies. He noted that the purpose of this recommendation is to ask the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy that standardizes requirements for lactation rooms and mandates inspections.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested using a different term than "nursing servicewoman" because Service members who experience the loss of a child can still be lactating after their pregnancy. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn moved to amend the recommendation to read, "The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that standardizes the requirements for and mandates Military Service inspections of lactation rooms to ensure they are suitable, accessible, private, and clean." Ms. Linderman seconded the motion.

Discussion on Amendment:

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested that the recommendation should not mandate requirements for inspection, as the Navy may inspect the rooms differently than the Marine Corps. Dr. Hunter agreed and clarified that the recommendation is to standardize requirements for lactation rooms but leave it up to the Services to decide how to inspect the rooms. She noted that establishing requirements for lactation rooms allows DoD to give the Services more flexibility in how they implement inspections. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff agreed with allowing the Services to decide on how to implement inspections, but suggested including inspection requirements such as a minimum time period for inspection in the recommendation. LTG (Ret.) Mangum said the recommendation as written is still focused on inspections and suggested revising the recommendation to address requirements for lactation rooms and their inspection. Ms. Linderman rescinded her initial amendment to the recommendation, and Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger approved.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum moved to amend the recommendation to read, "The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that standardizes the requirements for lactation rooms and mandates inspection standards to ensure they are suitable, accessible, private, and clean." Ms. Linderman seconded the motion.

Vote on Amendment: The Committee voted to adopt the amendment unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Discussion on Amended Recommendation: No additional discussion.

Vote on Amended Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the amended recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that standardizes the requirements for lactation rooms and mandates inspection standards to ensure lactation rooms are suitable, accessible, private, and clean.*

* * *

The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to provide education and guidance to commanders and supervisors that ensures compliance with policies for nursing servicewomen.

Dr. Hunter moved to adopt the recommendation. CAPT (Ret.) Barrett seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Dr. Hunter referred to the discussion for the previous breastfeeding and lactation recommendation and FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff's comment that "lactating servicewomen" may be more appropriate than "nursing servicewomen" because not all women who need to pump may be nursing.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum asked whether this recommendation is moot because of the previous recommendation ensuring DoD provide standards and inspections for lactation rooms. Dr. Hunter said there are additional policies for using lactation rooms, such as dictating appropriate breaks for lactating servicewomen, that necessitate education. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger said there is a general lack of understanding about these policies among Service members and leadership.

Dr. Hunter moved to amend the recommendation to read, "The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to provide education and guidance to commanders and supervisors that ensures compliance with policies for nursing servicewomen." Ms. Linderman seconded the motion.

Discussion on Amendment: No discussion.

Vote on Amendment: The Committee voted to adopt the amendment unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Discussion on Amended Recommendation: No discussion.

Vote on Amended Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the amended recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to provide education and guidance to commanders and supervisors that ensures compliance with policies for nursing servicewomen.*

J. Child Care Resources

The Secretary of Defense should allocate increased funding to address the lack of adequate childcare capacity and on- and off-installation child care resources, to include construction/expansion of child care facilities and initiatives to ensure sufficient child development center staffing and family child care home providers.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn moved to adopt the recommendation. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff seconded the motion.

Discussion:

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff commented about previous briefings the Committee had received on child care and felt the Committee should consider using “accelerated” or “prioritized” in the recommendation to signal the necessity for the Services to speed up the construction plans already in place.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon asked whether the unique circumstances for the Reserve component could be included in the reasoning because Reservists contend with inconsistent policies when trying to qualify for child care. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn responded that there is some mention of child care adequacy for the Reserve component in the reasoning but that they will ensure the coverage on that issue is more robust.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas sought clarification on the intent of the recommendation and whether it was asking the Secretary of Defense to allocate additional money for child care or if the recommendation was intended to prioritize the Services’ own internal funding for child care expansion. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn responded that she felt it is asking for increased funding and funds that could be earmarked specifically for child care. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn referenced recent versions of the National Defense Authorization Act that address child care as a problem. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger commented that DoD cannot

lobby Congress for earmarked funds. DoD is informed about its topline budget from the Executive Branch, and the Secretary of Defense allocates funding from the topline budget to the Services. RADM (Ret.) Thomas asked whether the Office of the Secretary of Defense would instruct the Services to prioritize child care funding from that topline budget number. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger responded affirmatively, stating that the budget oversight occurs at that level of leadership in the Department. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger also stated a check and balance occurs when the budget is forwarded from the President to Congress and Congress subsequently executes its responsibility to finalize DoD funding via Authorization and Appropriations Bills.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum asked whether there are other ways to improve child care access in the military beyond increasing funding, such as policy changes or prioritization of facilities. He noted he may not be familiar with all the briefings the Committee has received on the issue. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn responded that the reasoning covers other initiatives and practices the Services could rely on, including expedited background check processes for child care workers, compensation packages for child care workers, and increasing child care capacity on base. Although the recommendation does cover other measures, Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn said many of the issues are related to funding. LTG (Ret.) Mangum commented that the next child care recommendation to be discussed does include other options but that the two child care recommendations are more effective as separate recommendations. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger relayed that when asked, the Services stated that additional funding was necessary because there was a shortfall in funding for any approach they wanted to take to remedy child care issues.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas agreed with the funding issue but also commented that any shift in budget priorities from a topline budget could take away from other needs, such as building new ships or other materiel priorities. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger responded that there has been testimony to Congress by senior enlisted leaders describing child care as a readiness issue for Service members.

Ms. Hughes commented that the Committee could consider changing the recommendation language to read, “The Secretary of Defense should prioritize” to reflect that this effort should involve the prioritization of funding for child care. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger commented that she felt “prioritize” does not send a strong enough signal to the Secretary of Defense about this issue and welcomed discussion on that language. RADM (Ret.) Thomas felt allocating increased funding does reflect a prioritization of child care, and Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger commented that it is a way to communicate what the Committee believes is important. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff clarified that increased funding allocation to child care does not mean it will be used to execute change immediately. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger responded that budgets have documentation and that DoD is held accountable to how it uses the money in the budget. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff stated that she would not want to see increased child care capacity executed in 2025 when an increased budget allocation is occurring now. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger responded that budgets are based on 5-year timeframes, and FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff commented that could mean that new facilities will not be built until 2035. Col (Ret.) Boggs responded that Service representatives who delivered the last child care briefing at the June quarterly business meeting were pleased the Committee was going to take on this issue because they all said funding was their greatest barrier to increasing capacity.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should allocate increased funding to address the lack of adequate child care capacity and on- and off-installation child care resources, to include construction/expansion of child care facilities and initiatives to ensure sufficient child development center staffing and family child care home providers.*

* * *

The Secretary of Defense should review and revise the eligibility priority system for Child Development Centers detailed in DoDI 6060.02 (Child Development Programs) to ensure sufficient priority is afforded Service members to increase availability and reduce waitlist time.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn moved to adopt the recommendation. MAJ (Ret.) Locke seconded the motion.

Discussion:

RADM (Ret.) Thomas mentioned that the reasoning for this recommendation is directed toward Service members and wondered if, in this capacity, it includes the Coast Guard. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff said that the reasoning speaks to all Services and that although it does not enumerate the Services specifically, the intent was to include the Coast Guard. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested inserting “eligible” before “Service members,” as this would reduce the need to list all the Services. RADM (Ret.) Thomas added that during policy implementation, the Coast Guard, Reserve, and Guard are often excluded; therefore, these Services should be listed in the recommendation if the goal is to be totally inclusive.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff mentioned that the current wording of the recommendation implies that availability should be increased for Service members and that waitlist time should be reduced for all DoD employees. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn said that DoD employees do have priority over civilians and that is addressed in the reasoning. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff reiterated that the public should not have to read the reasoning to identify to whom the recommendation applies. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger suggested inserting “their” before “waitlist time” to clarify the intended audience. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn mentioned that in this recommendation, “availability” refers to having enough space in the child development centers. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger suggested inserting “overall” before “availability.” FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested inserting “in regards to Service members” to clarify the audience. Dr. Hunter suggested deleting “availability” and asked if the goal was solely to reduce waitlist time. CSM (Ret.) Jones responded that

availability, in addition to waitlist time, has been an issue and that this recommendation should address both.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn suggested replacing “sufficient priority” with “increased priority.” Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger agreed, noting that the phrase “sufficient priority” is open to interpretation.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum said that the issue is access to childcare but that the Committee is using terms such as “availability” and “wait time.” There is a capacity issue, but the recommendation addresses the policy component of the challenge. He suggested amending the wording to say either “improve access to child care” or “increase access to child care.”

MAJ (Ret.) Locke asked whether this particular recommendation addresses access to child development centers specifically rather than child care access in general. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn answered that this recommendation addresses child development centers specifically. Dr. Hunter asked whether child development programs addressed by the DoDI includes off-base programs. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn answered that it does include off-base programs but that this recommendation specifically addresses the prioritization system for child development centers outlined in the DoDI.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn suggested revising the recommendation to read, “The Secretary of Defense should review and revise the eligibility priority system for child care development centers detailed in DoDI 6060.02 (Child Development Programs) to ensure increased priority is afforded eligible Service members to improve access to child development centers.” Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon wondered whether it was necessary to specify child development centers in the recommendation. RADM (Ret.) Thomas said that it was necessary because it qualifies the recommendation.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested either “improve” or “include” be used instead of “increase.” Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger preferred “improve.”

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn moved to amend the recommendation to read, “The Secretary of Defense should review and revise the eligibility priority system for child care development centers detailed in DoDI 6060.02 (Child Development Programs) to ensure increased priority is afforded eligible Service members to improve availability and reduce waitlist time.” LTG (Ret.) Mangum seconded the motion.

Vote on Amendment: The Committee voted to adopt the amendment unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Discussion on Amendment: No discussion.

Discussion on Amended Recommendation: No discussion.

Vote on Amended Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the amended recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 14 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Mines, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should review and revise the eligibility priority system for Child Development Centers detailed in DoDI 6060.02 (Child Development Programs) to ensure increased priority is afforded eligible Service members to improve availability and reduce waitlist time.*

At this point, Ms. Mines left the meeting and was absent for the remainder of the voting session.

K. Domestic Abuse

The Secretary of Defense should expand DoDI 6400.06 (Domestic Abuse Involving DoD Military and Certain Affiliated Personnel) to include dating partners in the collection of domestic abuse data affecting servicewomen.

Ms. Hughes moved to adopt the recommendation. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn seconded the motion.

Discussion:

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff asked whether the recommendation was related to the previous day's briefing by FAP. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger responded that this recommendation is not related to the terminology discussed in that briefing and is intended to expand the term "intimate partner" to include dating partners.

Although acknowledging that DACOWITS is focused on matters relating to women in the Armed Forces, Dr. Hunter suggested that the recommendation use the term "Service members," rather than "servicewomen." She added that the Services should be directed to collect domestic abuse data regardless of gender.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon asked for clarification on whether the last time DACOWITS discussed domestic abuse as a topic was in 1996. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger replied that DACOWITS first addressed domestic abuse as a topic in 1996 and that it has not been addressed recently. Brig Gen (Ret.) Solomon was surprised that it had not been addressed since then considering that the previous day's briefing from FAP suggested that the Services were currently addressing domestic abuse. Ms. Hughes mentioned that the Services are addressing it currently, but that for the most part, they are concerned with intimate partners that cohabitate, have a child, or are former spouses. She added that "dating partners" is a much larger, more comprehensive term. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger added that there is precedent for studying dating partners given that the Air Force currently collects data using this term.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas asked about the intent of this recommendation and added that given recent UCMJ changes to categorize domestic abuse, a dating partner can be charged with a UCMJ offense. Dr. Hunter responded that the intent is data collection and

added that although a dating partner may be charged, the data about that charge will not be collected.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger commented that considering the previous day's briefing from FAP and that a policy update is already under consideration, voting on this recommendation would be both timely and pertinent to the already ongoing discussion in the Department.

Dr. Hunter moved to amend the recommendation to read, "The Secretary of Defense should expand DoDI 6400.06 (Domestic Abuse Involving DoD Military and Certain Affiliated Personnel) to include dating partners in the collection of domestic abuse data affecting Service members." LTG (Ret.) Mangum seconded the motion.

Vote on Amendment: The Committee voted to adopt the amendment unanimously.

- Favored: 13 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Discussion on Amendment: No discussion.

Discussion on Amended Recommendation:

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett raised a concern that the term "dating partners" was not comprehensive. Ms. Hughes mentioned that while the term "dating partners" may not be comprehensive, it will raise awareness by sending a signal to women that they do qualify for support and will allow FAP to provide assistance and support to more victims. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger agreed, adding that this recommendation is a step in the right direction.

Vote on Amended Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the amended recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 13 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should expand DoDI 6400.06 (Domestic Abuse Involving DoD Military and Certain Affiliated Personnel) to include dating partners in the collection of domestic abuse data affecting Service members.*

** ** *

The Secretary of Defense should implement a means for Service members suffering from domestic abuse to establish immediate and convenient access to resources and assistance, similar to the DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program and “Safe Helpline” offered to military sexual assault victims.

Ms. Hughes moved to adopt the recommendation. MAJ (Ret.) Locke seconded the motion.

Discussion:

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett noted that before the previous day’s briefing from FAP, he had not been aware of FAP’s 24-hour helpline. He asked whether this recommendation was directed toward building awareness of that helpline or if the recommendation was unrelated to that current program. Ms. Hughes responded that she went to the website to see how difficult it is to connect to the helpline. When she used the mobile app, Ms. Hughes was able to connect immediately. However, for the FAP Military OneSource website tool, she required an internet connection and had to log in, identify her location, and identify her needs. She was then sent a telephone number to call, and had to call to be connected. Ms. Hughes explained that this recommendation is to simplify those steps, increasing access to support. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger mentioned that this recommendation will reduce the onus placed on the victim when seeking support.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 13 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should implement a means for Service members suffering from domestic abuse to establish immediate and convenient access to resources and assistance, similar to the DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program and “Safe Helpline” offered to military sexual assault victims.*

* * *

The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that directs the Military Services to notify civilian law enforcement immediately after a military protective order is issued, and to solicit civilian law enforcement cooperation in assisting victims to obtain a civilian protective order.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn moved to adopt the recommendation. Ms. Linderman seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Dr. Hunter asked whether the recommendation addressed domestic abuse occurring on or off base and how this would affect international bases in which the foreign law enforcement uses a narrower definition of domestic abuse. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn responded that this recommendation specifically targets military protective orders, which can be issued only to military members and are not dependent on location. She continued that currently the policy does not require civilian law enforcement to be notified.

Ms. Hughes mentioned that although military law enforcement agrees there needs to be better communication between civilian law enforcement and military police, little is being done to promote cooperation. She added that of the servicewomen who were killed in the past year, a number of them had a military protection order in place, and they had been in contact with civilian enforcement, but that was not enough to save their lives. She continued that the intent of this recommendation is to address what appears to be the simplest solution to protect servicewomen on and off base.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum asked whether a civilian protective order is a law enforcement or judicial function. Ms. Hughes said that it is a judicial function but that it can help civilian law enforcement expedite the judicial process for the victim.

LTG (Ret.) Mangum suggested replacing “solicit civilian law enforcement cooperation” with “solicit civilian local police cooperation.” Col (Ret.) Boggs agreed, adding that when local police are made aware of a domestic abuse case, they can expedite the victim through the judicial process of getting a civilian protective order.

Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn pointed out that the concern is that the first individuals who are contacted off the installation about such a situation should be law enforcement, adding that although the system is not perfect, this recommendation moves in the right direction.

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett mentioned that after reading the reasoning for this recommendation, he had the impression that the author wanted to direct all Services to use the system that the Navy is using. He continued that if this is the case, the recommendation does not direct that. Ms. Hughes mentioned that this was not the intent of the recommendation. Instead, they chose to highlight the process the Navy was using but give the other Services room to create their own practices. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger agreed that although the reasoning can highlight the Navy’s current process as a best practice, it is important that the recommendation be broad enough to allow the other Services to implement a policy that is tailored to each branch.

CSM (Ret.) Jones commented that when there is a dearth of communication between local, civilian law enforcement and military police, civilian law enforcement is less effective, and added that most domestic abuse murders happen off base, where military protective orders are ineffective. Ms. Hughes agreed, noting the failure of some law enforcement to follow up with the victim and ensure they have support and access to services.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas asked whether the term “military protective order” could include valuable items or if its scope was limited to people. She also noted the recommendation does not use the term “domestic violence.” Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn responded that

military protective orders provide protection to people and that although it can include any type of injury, it typically is employed during domestic violence situations.

Dr. Hunter said it is clear that more need to be done. She also suggested that the last clause of the recommendation, “to obtain a civilian protective order,” be deleted from the recommendation to broaden the recommendation to include other services for which the victims could be eligible. Ms. Hughes responded that the intent of this recommendation is to make the connection between the military protective order and civilian law enforcement as the first and most important step. Dr. Hunter agreed but reiterated that in her view, the recommendation was too narrow. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger suggested the recommendation could be broadened by inserting “to include” before “a civilian protective order.” Col (Ret.) Boggs said it is far more important to go with the strongest recommendation that does not ask for less than what the Committee recommends. Dr. Hunter responded that in her view, the strongest recommendation is the broader one that includes more resources rather than specifically the civilian protective order. Ms. Hughes said focusing on the civilian protective order is key because it provides civilian law enforcement with more information and context for a situation. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger clarified that the intent was to keep the recommendation narrow. Dr. Hunter restated her suggestion that the recommendation be amended to say, “solicit civilian law enforcement cooperation in assisting victims, to include that they obtain a civilian protective order.” She continued to say that adding “to include” would ensure that the civilian protective order is addressed but that other services can also be included. CSM (Ret.) Jones stated obtaining the civilian protective order should be the first and foremost focus of the recommendation. She suggested inserting “and other related services” to the end of the recommendation.

Ms. Hughes wondered why this recommendation would ask civilian law enforcement to support services for an individual living on base who would already be receiving those services from FAP. CSM (Ret.) Jones responded that this recommendation should not only address those living on base because individuals living off base may not live close enough to benefit from the services FAP provides. Ms. Hughes responded that the recommendation was written from the perspective of those living on base. Col (Ret.) Boggs disagreed, adding that the recommendation should be directed to those living on base as well as off base.

MAJ (Ret.) Locke mentioned that she liked the simplicity of this recommendation, adding that it gives the Services something objective and finite to implement. Although she agreed with Dr. Hunter that there are more services available, she liked the simplicity of the current wording of the recommendation.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas wondered about the term “civilian restraining order” used in the reasoning for the recommendation, noting that the recommendation uses the phrase “civilian protective order.” She also suggested “domestic violence victims” be added to the recommendation. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn responded that although the term “restraining order” is used more frequently by the general public, “civilian protective order” is the DoD terminology for a restraining order. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff added that this is important because other countries may not use the phrase “restraining order.” She also suggested “immediately” be changed to “12 hours.” Ms. Hughes responded that the intent of the recommendation is that once the military police receive the military

protective order, they immediately notify civilian law enforcement. Col (Ret.) Boggs agreed, adding that although “immediately” can be interpreted with some latitude, the ambiguity allows the Services to tailor the policy. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger added that the use of “immediately” promotes urgency. Dr. Hunter agreed with FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff about the importance of conveying a sense of urgency, adding that she witnessed a situation in which law enforcement was instructed to complete a task immediately, and that task took precedent over the care of the victim.

Dr. Hunter asked whether there is currently any requirement to notify civilian law enforcement when a military protective order is issued. Col (Ret.) Boggs responded that it is not currently required. Dr. Hunter suggested that the wording in the recommendation be modified to say Military Services should notify civilian law enforcement “as a military protective order is issued” rather than “immediately after.”

MAJ (Ret.) Locke added that the protocol the Navy uses sets a precedence for using a database that simultaneously files for a civilian protective order and enters it into a database. CSM (Ret.) Jones responded that in a life-threatening situation, there is a need to send out an immediate notification rather than entering a request into a database. She added that typically, a database will not notify individuals and instead allows the user to see information only when queried.

Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger commented that the recommendation the Committee is making uses “immediately,” which DoD can adjust or define, and that the Committee can expand on the definition in the reasoning. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff agreed, adding that the phrase “domestic violence” should be added to the recommendation to differentiate among the myriad of reasons that military protective orders can be issued. LTG (Ret.) Mangum agreed, noting that most military protective orders are issued by commanders and that there is not a requirement for the commander to notify either military law enforcement or civilian law enforcement.

RADM (Ret.) Thomas asked whether the recommendation should be directed toward domestic violence or domestic abuse. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff responded that it should be directed toward domestic abuse.

Col (Ret.) Boggs moved to amend the recommendation to say, “The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that directs the Military Services to notify civilian law enforcement immediately after a military protective order is issued for domestic abuse, and to solicit civilian law enforcement cooperation in assisting victims to obtain a civilian protective order and other related services.” Dr. Hunter seconded the motion.

Discussion on Amendment:

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff suggested that language be added to the recommendation to include notifying military police in addition to civilian law enforcement when a military protective order is issued. Ms. Hughes responded that a request to notify military police is not included in the recommendation because they already receive notice when a military protective order is issued. Brig Gen (Ret.) Sanborn said that in her experience, military law enforcement notifies civilian law enforcement, and added that the recommendation should not dictate who notifies civilian law enforcement, just that they be notified. LTG (Ret.) Mangum raised a concern about using “immediately” in the recommendation with

respect to when military police are notified by the commander issuing the military protective order. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff said in her experience, it is the military legal office, not military law enforcement that notifies civilian law enforcement. Dr. Hunter mentioned that considering that more than one party may notify civilian law enforcement, the recommendation should not dictate who notifies civilian law enforcement. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger agreed that the recommendation should not define who notifies civilian law enforcement.

Ms. Hughes mentioned her opposition to the term “other related services” in the recommendation. CSM (Ret.) Jones responded that if the Committee did not like that language, it could strike that from the wording. Ms. Hughes referenced her considerable experience working on the civilian side to obtain civilian protective orders for victims and noted civilian law enforcement does not stop offering services and support after the process for issuing a civilian protective order begins. She added it is already anticipated civilian law enforcement will provide other services, so it does not need to be stated in the recommendation. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff agreed with Ms. Hughes regarding the process in the United States but noted that the language “and other related services” may provide additional support to victims outside of the United States. Dr. Hunter agreed with FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff and added that this language could also provide additional support to victims in the United States who are working with sister agencies. She also said it is important to have a policy that is DoD wide.

Vote on Amendment: The Committee voted to adopt the amendment.

- Favored: 12 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 1 (Ortloff)

Discussion on Amended Recommendation:

CAPT (Ret.) Barrett noted that although he learned a lot from the discussion, he was concerned about potential unintended ramifications. He wondered if commanders would be disinclined to issue military protective orders. He agreed with FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff that more rigorous research and discussion needed to take place before a recommendation could be made.

CSM (Ret.) Jones responded that in the current environment, both in the private and public sectors, domestic violence and abuse are not being addressed appropriately. She also said although this recommendation will not address all the systemic problems, it will demonstrate that DACOWITS knows that this is an issue that needs to be addressed at the level of the Secretary of Defense.

Vote on Amended Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the amended recommendation.

- Favored: 12 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 2 (Ortloff, Barrett)

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should establish a DoD policy that directs the Military Services to notify civilian law enforcement immediately after a military protective order is issued for domestic abuse, and to solicit civilian law enforcement cooperation in assisting victims to obtain a civilian protective order and other related services.*

L. Pregnancy Reassignments

The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to develop and implement policies that ensure a servicewoman's career is not negatively affected as a result of pregnancy.

Col (Ret.) Boggs moved to adopt the recommendation. Ms. Hughes seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Dr. Hunter commented that the theme of a servicewoman's career being negatively affected as a result of her pregnancy was reported by Service members across all ranks and genders during this year's installation visit focus groups. She inquired what this recommendation is asking the Services to do and whether the Committee has any evidence to show there are structural limitations that negatively affect the careers of servicewomen who become pregnant. Col (Ret.) Boggs noted that promotion policies across the board are moving in the right direction to ensure promotions are based on merit, but that is a problem for servicewomen who become pregnant because they have to spend time away from their jobs and can be reassigned to a new specialty occupation. He noted that when a servicewoman who took maternity leave comes up for promotion, she will not look as good as other Service members who did not take maternity leave because of the time she spent away from her job. He explained that the Services have a variety of policies in place to mitigate negative impacts on the careers of servicewomen who become pregnant. For example, the Navy's policy states that a servicewoman should not be negatively affected by taking pregnancy leave, and the Marine Corps' policy states that a servicewoman returning from maternity leave should return to the same unit and job she had when she began her leave and be evaluated by the same evaluators. He noted the Coast Guard's policy is even stronger for servicewomen who go on maternity leave because their careers are paused during leave, so the time they spend away does not count against them for promotions. However, he noted that even with these policies in place, there are still negative perceptions of servicewomen who become pregnant.

Dr. Hunter presented a hypothetical situation: if there are two infantry Marines, and one becomes pregnant and the other does not, the pregnant Marine must be pulled from the field; therefore, objectively, she is not as qualified as the other Marine, who was able to continue working in his or her position. Col (Ret.) Boggs responded that the complication

is that if a servicewoman is allowed to return from maternity leave and reunite with her peer group, she may fail promotion because she is not as qualified as the other Service members in her peer group. He noted that the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard recognize that promotion should be based on performance, and servicewomen returning from maternity leave should be rated fairly; however, the Army reported during the June quarterly business meeting briefing on pregnancy and parenthood policies that it does not have a policy to protect women from having their careers negatively affected because of maternity leave. He noted the importance of ensuring that all the Military Services are aligned in their pregnancy and promotion policies. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger noted that the recommendation does not tell Services how to solve the problem, but instead highlights the issue for DoD so it can look into how to ensure servicewomen who want to have families can still succeed in the military.

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted that pregnancy is a temporary medical condition, so leadership could address the issue of pregnancy affecting promotion similar to how they address Service members who break a leg and are unable to participate in physical fitness tests and, therefore, cannot achieve a perfect score. She agreed that there are also other issues outside of policy that affect promotions for women who return from maternity leave, such as the associated negative perceptions of their peers. Col (Ret.) Boggs noted the Coast Guard policy of pausing the careers of servicewomen on maternity leave helps mitigate the negative perceptions issue. Coast Guard members also no longer must cover for servicewomen during maternity leave because the Service brings in reservists to fill those positions temporarily.

CSM (Ret.) Jones noted that pregnant Service members, especially enlisted Service members, are not allowed to attend some military schools. She also noted that Service members who become pregnant are pulled from deployment, and their peers often believe they became pregnant on purpose to avoid being deployed. However, she noted that pregnant Service members who are medically cleared should be allowed to deploy and attend currently restricted classes because the medical understanding of what pregnant women can do has expanded since the policies limiting their participation were implemented. She noted that the policies are misaligned with the current medical literature.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 13 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should direct the Military Services to develop and implement policies that ensure a servicewoman's career is not negatively affected as a result of pregnancy.*

M. Women's Reintegration

The Secretary of Defense should commission a research project to identify and assess the potentially unique impacts on military mothers who are reintegrating into the family after deployments.

Col (Ret.) Boggs moved to adopt the recommendation. FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff seconded the motion.

Discussion: No discussion.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 13 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Final Recommendation: *The Secretary of Defense should commission a research project to identify and assess the potentially unique impacts on military mothers who are reintegrating into the family after deployments.*

N. Continuing Concern: Maternity Uniforms

Ms. Linderman moved to adopt the continuing concern. MAJ (Ret.) Locke seconded the motion.

Discussion:

FLTCM (Ret.) Ortloff noted that some of the Services have good maternity uniform designs, whereas others do not. She suggested that the Committee recommend the Services collaborate to discuss their efforts to improve maternity uniforms before the Committee requests another briefing from them on this topic. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger mentioned there is collaboration across some Services to improve maternity uniforms, but she noted the collaborative efforts likely did not include all the Services. Col (Ret.) Boggs suggested the Committee ask the Services to bring maternity uniforms along to show the Committee during the next briefing on the topic. Gen (Ret.) Wolfenbarger confirmed the Committee suggested this for yesterday's briefing on maternity uniforms, but the Committee can formalize the request for the next briefing to ensure the briefers comply.

Vote on Recommendation: The Committee voted to adopt the recommendation unanimously.

- Favored: 13 (Wolfenbarger, Jones, Barrett, Locke, Thomas, Solomon, Mangum, Hunter, Ortloff, Sanborn, Linderman, Boggs, Hughes)
- Opposed: 0
- Abstained: 0

Meeting was adjourned.

RFI 1

WOMEN’S RETENTION (R&R)

The Committee has been examining the overall numbers of women in the military, as well as by race and ethnicity. After conducting an analysis of the data that the [Defense Manpower Data Center](#) (DMDC) provided in March 2019, the Committee noted that some Services had significant increases in areas compared to other Services. The Committee also noted a lack of female representative among senior women in many of the Services. The percentage of women in the Services overall is disproportionate to the total number of women in the United States. [Please refer to the [Infographic](#) available for download on the DACOWITS home page, located under the ‘quick links’.]

The Committee requests a **written response** from the **Military Services** utilizing the data provided to the Committee in [March 2019](#) (refer to Infographic):

- a. To all Services, to what do you attribute the disparity in the percentage of total women to your total force, as compared to the population of the country?
- b. To what does the Navy attribute the 5% improvement in the numbers of all women between 2008-2018?
- c. To what does the Coast Guard (5%), Marine Corps (13%) and the Air Force (11%) attribute their gain in Hispanic women between 2008-2018?
- d. To what does the Army attribute the high number of racially diverse (65%) senior enlisted women in 2018?
- e. To all the Services, to what do you attribute the overall low percentage of senior women officers (O-7 and above), and even lower or non-existent percentages of senior women officers with ethnic or racial diversity?

Organization	Description
Army	The Army provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI, attributing the high number of racially diverse senior enlisted women in 2018 to the propensity for racially diverse women to reenlist.
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI, attributing the 5-percent improvement in the numbers of all women between 2008 and 2018 to several policy levers and initiatives aimed at female accessions and retention.
Marine Corps	The Marine Corps provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI, attributing the gain in Hispanic women between 2008 and 2011 to increases in the percentage of the high-quality women accessed during this period who happened to be Hispanic, or of Hispanic descent.
Air Force	The Air Force provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI, attributing the gain in Hispanic women between 2008 and 2011 to increased advertising spending in

	geographically diverse areas and increased inclusion of diverse races and genders in advertisements.
Coast Guard	The Coast Guard provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI, noting that it has not conducted an analysis to directly attribute the gain in Hispanic women between 2008 and 2011.

RFIs 3 and 4	
WOMEN IN SHIPS (E&I)	
<p>The Committee received a briefing from the Navy in March 2019 about the status of women in ships, as well as written follow up information on the current status of women on ships. In order to obtain a more complete picture of servicewomen’s opportunities at sea, the Committee is looking to obtain historical information.</p>	

RFI 3	
<p>The Committee requests a written response from the Navy concerning the Navy’s Career Management System-Interactive Detailing (CMS-ID) rack availability error messaging on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. From 1 January 2015 to 30 June 2019: How many times has this error message been activated when someone applies for orders, to indicate published available orders were not available due to lack of rack availability for that gender? Please break down by month, year, rating, and gender. b. What does the message specifically state? Please provide a screenshot of this message. c. What is the action to be taken by the member applying when they receive this error? d. What office oversees the assignment of women at sea balance to ensure no platforms are reducing rack availability on a long term basis? 	
Organization	Description
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.

RFI 4

In reviewing the information provided by the Navy, the Committee remains concerned about the Mineman rating/occupational specialty. Therefore, the Committee requests an additional **written response** from the **Navy** to address the following:

- a. The number of enlisted Minemen for the following years: 2007, 2012, and 2018, broken down by pay grade (E1-E9) and gender.
- b. The attrition rate for enlisted Minemen for the following years: 2007, 2012, and 2018, broken down by pay grade (E1-E9) and gender.
- c. The number of billets on ships that have Minemen billets, according to the ships manning document by gender, rank structure, and ship type.

Organization	Description
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.

RFI 5

GENDER INTEGRATION (E&I)

Following the December 3, 2015, decision by the Secretary of Defense to open all previously closed units and positions to women, the Committee has been closely monitoring the Services' efforts to develop, enhance and implement plans to fully integrate women into all occupational specialties.

The Committee requests copies of the **Army, Marine Corps, Navy and Air Force** most recent Gender Integration Implementation Plans provided to Congress.

Organization	Description
Army	The Army provided the Committee with the 2018 Gender Integration Implementation Plan it provided to Congress.
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with the annual assessment regarding the full integration of women in the Navy.
Marine Corps	The Marine Corps noted that it provided the most recent Gender Integration Implementation Plan to Congress. This is titled Fragmentary Order 4 (Implementation) to Marine Corps Force Integration Campaign Plan and is designated For Official Use Only.
Air Force	The Air Force provided the Committee with the 2018 Gender Integration Implementation Plans provided to Congress.

RFIs 7 and 9

DOMESTIC ABUSE / DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AFFECTING SERVICEWOMEN (WB&T)

Recently, media headlines have spotlighted multiple servicewomen being affected by domestic abuse and domestic violence. The Committee is concerned about the impacts of these incidences on the safety and welfare of servicewomen as well as on operational readiness.

RFI 7

The Committee requests a **written response** from each of the **Military Services (to include the Reserves and National Guard)** with information regarding safe housing for servicewomen who are victims of domestic violence (DV), to include details on the following:

- a. The current policies and procedures that ensure the safety of DV victims once incidents occurs. Please include data on where Service members are housed if they need to be removed to safe or alternate housing (to include whether it is on- or off-based housing).
- b. Explain how your Service interprets “suitable, safe and alternate housing” for victims of domestic violence per DoDI 6400.06.

Organization	Description
Army	The Army provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Marine Corps	The Marine Corps provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Air Force	The Air Force provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Coast Guard	The Coast Guard provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
National Guard Bureau	The National Guard Bureau provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI. In doing so, it noted that it does not offer a curriculum on domestic abuse response and intervention training.

RFI 9

The Committee requests a **written response** from the **Military Services (to include the Reserves and the National Guard)** outlining the curriculum objectives for your Services' Domestic Abuse Response and Intervention Training. Include frequency of training, required attendees, etc.

Organization	Description
Army	The Army provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Marine Corps	The Marine Corps provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Air Force	The Air Force provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Coast Guard	The Coast Guard provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
National Guard Bureau	The National Guard Bureau provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI. In doing so, it noted that it does not implement policies or procedures to provide support/services to victims of domestic violence, nor does it offer housing to any Service members.

RFIs 10 and 11

CHILD CARE RESOURCES (WB&T)

Comprehensive childcare has been an ongoing challenge for Service members and has been highlighted as such by DACOWITS for more than 35 years. The ongoing lack of childcare creates a strain on military families and impacts to unit operations.

RFI 10

The Committee requests a **written response** from each of the **Military Services (include information on the Reserves and National Guard)** on the following:

- a. Specific regulations and policies that govern fee assistance programs, including the eligibility of Service members for fee assistance, the criteria for on- and off-installation care providers, and facilities to qualify for receipt of fee assistance. Please include:
 - i. What regulations and policies govern fee assistance programs?
 - ii. How many Service members are receiving fee assistance?
 - iii. How many were denied fee assistance and any reasons for denial?
 - iv. Information on proposed or pending changes and initiatives (e.g., in June 2019 the Army briefed it was “reforming” its fee assistance program).
 - v. Indicate whether Service members on a waiting list are automatically eligible for fee assistance even if they otherwise might not qualify; and if not, why not?
 - vi. If a Service member is receiving fee assistance and space becomes available in the installation child care facility, is the Service member required to move their children to the on-base care facility?
 - vii. What challenges impact the provision of fee assistance?
 - viii. Are Service members denied assistance due to lack of funding?

Organization	Description
Army	The Army provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Marine Corps	The Marine Corps provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Air Force	The Air Force provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Coast Guard	The Coast Guard provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
National Guard Bureau	The National Guard Bureau provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.

RFI 11

The Committee requests a **written response** from each of the **Military Services (include information on the Reserves and National Guard)** to update and provide details on the following:

- a. What factors impact willingness to become or remain a family care provider? Incentives/disincentives?
- b. What is the current enrollment in the Family Child Care (FCC) program? What is the shortfall or waiting list for this program?
- c. Is fee assistance available to Service members who place children in care with an FCC?
- d. What is the average timeframe to certify an FCC?
- e. Address the portability of an FCC’s certification to another installation? Must a previously or currently certified FCC undergo the full certification process upon transfer to a different installation?
- f. What challenges confront the Services in recruiting and retaining FCCs?
- g. Air Force: Please elaborate on the June QBM 2019 (slide 2) statement: “Enhanced the Expanded Child Care Program.”
- h. Coast Guard: Please elaborate on the June QBM 2019 (slide 2) statement: “Currently, collaborating with Coast Guard Foundation on providing incentives for new FCC providers.”

Organization	Description
Army	The Army provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Navy	The Navy provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Marine Corps	The Marine Corps provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Air Force	The Air Force provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
Coast Guard	The Coast Guard provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI.
National Guard Bureau	The National Guard Bureau provided the Committee with responses to all the questions in this RFI. In doing so, it noted that it does not utilize family care providers, nor does it operate the Family Child Care program.

Report Submitted by:


COL Toya J. Davis, USA
DACOWITS Military Director

Report Certified by:


Gen (Ret.) Janet C. Wolfenbarger, USAF
DACOWITS Chair

Members in Attendance:

CAPT (Ret.) Kenneth J. Barrett, USN
Col (Ret.) John T. Boggs, USMC
Ms. Therese A. Hughes
Dr. Kyleanne M. Hunter, USMC Veteran
CSM (Ret.) Michele S. Jones, USA
Ms. LeeAnne B. Linderman
MAJ (Ret.) Priscilla W. Locke, USA

LTG (Ret.) Kevin W. Mangum, USA
Ms. Janie L. Mines, USN Veteran
FLTCM (Ret.) JoAnn M. Ortloff, USN
Brig Gen (Ret.) Jarris J. Sanborn, USAF
Brig Gen (Ret.) Allyson R. Solomon, ANG
RADM (Ret.) Cari B. Thomas, USCG
Gen (Ret.) Janet C. Wolfenbarger, USAF

Ex-Officio Member in Attendance:

Ms. Jacquelyn D. Hayes-Byrd, Executive Director, Department of Veterans Affairs' Center for Women Veterans, USAF Veteran

Absent Members:

Lt Gen (Ret.) Judith A. Fedder, USAF
SGM (Ret.) Norma J. Helsham, USA