

## Joint Diversity Executive Council (JDEC) Meeting

2 October 2017

### Attendees:

<b>Maj Gen Mark Bartman (TAG) Chairperson</b>	<b>CCMSgt Thomas Jones (Air CCM) Member</b>
<b>M.G. John Harris (ATAG) First Vice Chairperson</b>	<b>CSM Rodger Jones ( Army CSM) Member</b>
<b>COL Randall Shears (CoS) Member</b>	<b>MAJ Robert Paley (Aide de Camp)</b>
<b>Col Gary McCue (DoSA) Member</b>	<b>SFC Justin Douglas (EO Assist)</b>
<b>Col William Giezie (DoHRO) Member</b>	<b>SGT Brittany Melton (Recorder)</b>
<b>MSG Michelle White (SEEM) DIA</b>	

### Agenda: Opening Remarks from MSG White

No remarks

### CNGB Checklist for Diversity and Inclusion:

No Remarks

### Action Items:

**Maj Gen Bartman:** The video is actually not finished and will possibly discuss changes based on feedback. I just went to a Leading diverse organization course at Harvard. The course had 60 individuals from all over the world in the class, I sent out the link of our video to all of the classmates to ask for feedback. I have also sent that feedback out to MSG White. I have also sent out the British army video on their Diversity and Inclusion video, I really liked that one and thought the way they brought it together was nice. Most of the feedback I received on our video was good, they liked it. We do still Need TAG notes for my remarks in the video.

### Played the Video

### Diversity Day Noncompliant Units:

**MG Harris:** Did they do quizzes? The dunk tank asked questions while they were participating. Agreed with food being popular.

**Col McCue-** the 180<sup>th</sup> on the slide needs to be taken off because they concluded their action.

**COL Shears-** The reason some of the MSC's did not complete the training was because they were going to trying to provide stuff for things going on in this building but had an issue with having to sign releases. The Commands found out too late. We have had issues with Live streaming our guest for our observances because they may not want to sign the waiver to be filmed.

### ONG Affirmative Action Plan:

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I thought we went away from matching the areas in Ohio by Region and just went with doing the state of Ohio in general. (Which is Correct MSG White explained she was giving an

example of the changes). I have a question about calling this an affirmative action plan. Saying it is an Affirmative Action plan implicates a bias with that name. I think we need to change the name to maybe the Ohio National Guard Diversity and Inclusion Plan, I think that sounds better.

**Colonel McCue:** I agree, people reference the name and associate it with a political contact or agenda and it can lead to a negative connotation.

**MG Harris:** I agree the Affirmative Action name has a negative connotation and should be changed.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Looking at the plan can we go to page 4 and look at section 1-2 in the policy. Under that section, can we talk about the gender identify. I think we should change the wording with that. Also, can you explain how the Title VI acts apply to the Ohio Guard specifically? I am not familiar with it and I want to understand how it applies to our organization. I do not want to reinvent the wheel, so we do not need to reinstate the policy just reference it.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Moving to section 5-C- I have a question, we need to define what a representative is, either a better definition or be more specific with what is in there.

**MG Harris:** When we say representative are we talking every MOS or Unit I think it needs to be more specific.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** In section 1-5-E: What does upward mobility mean? Emotion attached to that term. Reference Book, I want everyone to buy talks about gender and implicate bias. Upward mobility is also one of those words and needs to be looked at in this section.

**MG Harris:** On section 1-5-E do they really mean offering the opportunity to let any individual rise through the ranks?

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Book I want everyone to purchase because it is a great read is What Works: Gender Equality by Design it is by Iris Bohnet and it was printed by the Harvard Press.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** An Example of a scenario from this book when it comes to research in gender bias; is that they found that Females are less likely to guess if the answer has a negative connotation on their SATS's in comparison to males and that's why there have been a 20 point difference in taking SATS. This lead to SATs changing their procedures.

I also brought back all of the Power Points from the professors from the course I just went to at Harvard. As a graduate of the course, I am allowed to use that material. I just needs to put it together and send it out. I have also read that research shows that mentoring programs do not work.

We also need to have Minority groups or Females being more included by having senior level management being more involved in the careers of the people we think have a bright future within the organization. This makes it more of sponsorship as opposed to mentoring. This could include making sure the people get certain roles to develop individuals to a certain point. We need to think about implementing this in the guard in some way, even though I understand it can be difficult in our type of organization.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** In section 1-6-E this lists the ONGR regulation, has this regulation been reviewed recently? This might need to be something we need to do. Also, let's make sure everyone gets a copy of this regulation.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** When we are talking about the Staff responsibility- or the State Inspection General, I am not understanding how that directly involves us in the guard because 98% of the force are federal employees.

**COL Shears:** The IG now falls under the COS it just hasn't been moved on TAGNET.

**MG Harris:** In regards to the State inspection general, are we referring to the state IG, they are the ones who used to lead an inspection program. I am trying to put more back on leaders and having company commanders be responsible for conducting inspections.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** On page 6 in section L I want to address the surveys that everyone is required to do, is this the same for everyone (In regards to Army and Air)? Air is different than the Army on conducting these surveys.

Can you look at adding in questions to the survey that the command can add themselves, should we have standard questions that the JDAC requires to have the AIR and Army add to their surveys? I am sure there would be push back, can you do more than 10 questions? This may be something we need to really look into, when I was a wing commander I would specifically add in questions that pertain to the organization and what I was trying to get feedback on.

**MG Harris:** I think we need to come up with some questions that need to be added in. We as the JDAC can review the feedback and compare more information with Air and Army. Talking with people who can analyze the answers to this as well.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Can you take the survey on anything? Or does it have to be a government computer?

**MSG White:** You can take it on anything and some companies will bring in computers for their people, so they don't have to do it on their phones. They have seen good results with that.

**MG Harris:** The command should be briefing their Soldiers, they take the survey and then the command tells them what they are doing about it.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** It was my sense that the survey was not being used like it should be. So I think adding the questions and analyzing the feedback at our level would be a good idea. It is my hope that this instills that in the commanders how important they are. If they know we will be looking at it they will be more likely to talk with their people, I think all in all we need to do some work on the surveys.

**MG Harris:** Part of the challenge is because the commanders are shy about using the information for fear of adverse actions. These company commanders are young in their career and probably CPTs, they may not know how or what to do about it. Or how to send it, because I am not getting any of the results from these surveys.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Do the GO's give feedback? On the Air side the first GO should be CC'd on the results so they can look at the results from all the wings. Is there a way to complete this?

**MG Harris:** I really want to want to see the results from these because I cannot mentor subordinating units without that information. If I don't know what the issues are I cannot address them with the MSC's and then in turn they cannot address them with their subordinate units.

**COL Shears:** They may be action'ing them to be fair, however we may just not be seeing them.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Yes, I don't want to read these surveys to look for punitive actions, but we want to see what is going on. Now, lots of people will fill them out in anger so you need to go into it with that understanding but at the very least we can take that to the corresponding commander and ask about the remarks and what they are doing about them. I just think we need to figure out how to do a better job on getting visibility at this level from those, maybe provide a role up of the results and send it to senior leadership. Get sample product and we can make changes from there.

**MG Harris:** on this page in section B, I want to clarify that this is implying that the company commander is responsible but that is not true, get rid of the word subordinate.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** On page 9 Chapter 2, we need to rename this section to get rid of the name. Also in the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence how can a plan ensure equal treatment? This should be more of commanders, because people are responsible for ensuring this and not a piece of paper. Maybe change the term to Leaders to incorporate all senior leadership. Last sentence you are saying you have to do it but in reality you do not have to do it. We need to have goals maybe not quotas.

**MG Harris:** I think it was there to maybe get rid of the stigma with the affirmative action but maybe no sentence is better than having one.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Under Milestone 2 in the chart, I am curious are all of these ranks listed by regulation? I just wanted to make sure the ranks were not arbitrary ranks we made up and that they are actually spelled out in a regulation.

**COL Shears:** The problem is people think it needs to be in the max rank on the army side and no one wants to give up a MAJ for example.

**MG Harris:** Yes it is hard on the army side because unlike our air counterpart they have specific positions for these jobs. Last sentence, can we annotate what the programs are.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I want to talk about the charts with all of the percentages on next page, I am curious as to where the percentages are coming from? Where are we getting this from, my assumption is that we already have these programs going on? Or is that not happening? We should already be 100% because it is the beginning of the FY we should be starting at 100%. Why are the numbers so low?

**Col Giezie:** The problem is on the Army side at least, if you look at the top of the side. In the Air guard these positions are on the MD's but that is not the same on the army side because it is considered an additional duty.

**MG Harris:** It should not be considered an additional duty, it is a primary duty. You are right the hard part is on the army side it is not on the MTOE. So, we end up taking an excess officer and placing making that their sole job. It becomes an issue however when you have 6 misplaced officers. The other thing that is a challenge is getting the seats for the course.

**Col Giezie:** We are looking at company and battalion as opposed to MSC. I think 85% would be good to attain for these percentages.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I understand the issues but as senior leaders if this is something that we find important than we need to figure out a way to complete this task. The 25% and 30% we are accepting a low bar.

**MG Harris:** I can fix the inspection aspect faster (when looking at MSC's). I think we had better success when we were mobilizing people because we were getting them out the door as part of a pre-deployment requirement.

**COL Shears:** I think we have been proactive for the next year. I think we will see better results because now our commanders can identify these courses 8 months out and project the budget on who to send and when to send them.

**MG Harris:** We will make sure we get the funding to fix this issues with classes

**Maj Gen Bartman:** We now need to look at the number of seats and who we are training and add that into the percentages and add that into this section. I agree we may never get to 100% but the goal should be.

**COL Shears:** I think we also run into issues when it comes to the EPS. We end up getting the areas covered and we get the EOL's distributed correctly but then they are promoted and the EOL's are now spread out to different locations.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I get it with the turnover, but we need to understand the problem and when it will be fixed.

**SFC Douglas:** If you think about it we are taking the EOLs and they will eventually become interested in becoming EOA's. So once you saturate the field with EOLs it will be better for the force to select new EOAs. Also once you have more EOAs in-place to train EOLs the easier the whole program becomes as far as management.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Moving to 2-4 milestones 2, 3, and 4. General thought what are the state of Ohio's numbers? And are we laying them down on top of the goals that are listed here? Can we add in more verbiage? They need to understand where exactly these numbers are coming from.

**Col Giezie:** Everything on here is about what we would be looking at in 2026. This hits the mid points, everything listed minus the females are generated from the current trends. The only one that was truly bad were the African Americans on the Air side. Thee female percentages came from the senior leaders and what they wanted to see us go. For the other ones we can add in statements where the Ohio guard is today and where we will be in the future.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I also think that the milestone 5 should be added into that group. Also, we use a lot of percentages, should we also add in what the numbers would actually be? It would be much easier for people to comprehend if we knew, okay, I have to increase the African American numbers by 10.

**Col Giezie:** You are right this shows the amount for all of the years combined but not per year. That is something we can do.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Yes, can we simplify the math for these charts? And actually spell it out, simplify the data so we can present this data better and then we can hopefully get a better response when it gets rolled out.

An interesting point, I am not sure if we can considered and I am not sure how this will impact us because I know we have to follow DoD rules, but one of the senior DNI leaders said that they got feedback on this topic.

The question was asked “what is the correct terminology, do I say black, or African American” The answer was that the majority of the black individuals are not actually from Africa so they do not consider themselves to be African Americans.

**MG Harris:** I am following this stuff on social media right now because this topic has been on fire especially by black members of the community.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Yes, this generated a huge discussion at my course, because we are grouping everyone into category they may not want to be put in.

**MG Harris:** You also have white immigrants that come from Africa and they are African American, so you need to think about this, it is a divisive term.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I want to raise this question, what is the school house answer? I want to make sure we are not disenfranchising anyone person or group. So do we have any wiggle room with this? As we continue to work this than how do we get past some of these things? We want to make sure we don't have commanders who don't say anything because they don't want to offend someone so they find ways around doing it. Is this mentioned or brought up in the EOLC course?

**MG Harris:** It is interesting because just last night I was on Facebook and someone posted on there about this topic and women commented and said it was a great post but she corrected him on him using the term “black” and telling them it was “African American”. She was blasted by people because people are saying they have never been to Africa so they are not African Americans. So this is definitely an important conversation people are having.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** It brings up an interesting point because we had a Women in our class that was from India, and she shared some eye watering stories with us because you know they still have a cast system with arrange marriages and all of that. However, because of her skin color, she was lighter and even though I thought her completion was beautiful in her country she was considered undesirable. It is interesting to think because of our location in the world how we are viewed.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Under page 12, where it says new comers' to the organization: I think we need to figure out a way to benchmark best practices in the industry. It would be a good idea to set up meetings with the big company's (AEP) and ask how they teach new comers about their Diversity and Inclusion practices. It wouldn't hurt to see how others are doing, specifically maybe a company who is known for their Diversity and Inclusion.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Under milestone 1 on the next page they have the same % and the same comments as previously stated about these. On page 14 on the top under milestone 3, according to research mentor programs do not work then we need to start looking at different ways to implement sponsorship. If we still use that term, mentorship than we need to better define that to our senior leadership. What rules we have when it comes to putting people in positions?

**COL Shears:** That is actually the first thing they tell officers, you need to find someone who can help you throughout your career.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I have been in the guard for years and I have seen multiple mentorship programs that keep failing, and no one truly understands what they should be doing. If you're not helping the

person in some way then you not really truly mentoring them in their career and having them move up the ladder of success. So what can and what can't we do?

**MG Harris:** I think that a barrier for this is that in the Army it is instilled to us that we treat everyone the same, So if you are mentoring someone and you take them to lunch, then by having lunch with them, you are treating a person different. You have to change the mindset, and you have to understand a relationship will be different with someone you are mentoring. It still needs to be professional, but it will be different.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** if we are going to get to these goals then we have to have a plan, if we do nothing then we are not going to meet our goals. It has never worked so we need to figure out what we can change to make it work.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** On page 16 at the top, we have talked about exit interviews, the term "targeted focus groups". What some organizations have done is called employee resource groups, and another way to get around infinity group is these resource groups because anyone can be a member and the key is how you use the ERG's is when you have a problem you need solved you take it to the ERG and they come up with the solution.

Maybe do some research with what **Dwight**? has done with these groups and see what you can find out, because they are so widely known it would be a good thing to look at. Plus you are not excluding everyone because anyone can be a part of the group.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** In the 2-10 Selection for key enlisted positions, I am not exactly sure what we are doing here.

**Col Giezie:** We are looking at where we are in general among the force and where we are in the key positions. We would say we want to be 30% female and can we have that in the key leader positions so if you cannot get that amount for E7's than in a few years you won't meet that with E9's. However we can see success with the lower ranks and then building a strategy on how to eventually obtain those goals.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** So if we, as opposed to trying to set quotas if we build the organization based off of the overall Diversity and Inclusion goals then we will get to where we want to be eventually.

**Col Giezie:** We also need to identify the barriers, example we may have the 30% met in females in the lower ranks but what is the barrier to get to those higher ranks.

**COL Shears:** It may be society issues and that is not something we can fix.

**Col Giezie:** We may always struggle with these, do we reach out to the male spouses as much as we do with the female spouse. I am sure that plays into the development in our organization. What does the family impact on females if they want to have a family? These things can be real hurdles, these are things we need to look at what we need to be doing in order to overcome these barriers.

**MG Harris:** What makes it tough, I want to speak on two things. The 1<sup>st</sup>, command chief and SGM positions we need to make sure we are identifying the right people. I am not going to mentor everyone who wouldn't have the potential. I am not sure what the correct verbiage is but just because someone is black doesn't mean we mentor them to be a SGM, I am not sure what the right answer is but we need to

make sure we are getting the right people and start dragging them along. 2<sup>nd</sup>, when I was in the G1 who were single mothers and they couldn't do everything the others could how do we address this so that I am not having a bias against these single parents with it comes to progression because they couldn't work late/ come in early or do weekends with SRP's.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** What are you seeing in these EPS packets that are showing you that the minorities and females are not being mentored? We need to look hard at the process just because we have always done things a specific way doesn't mean it is the right way and we could be potentially be bias against someone.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** When it comes to hiring boards, they have gotten away from doing boards they complete individual interviews so there is no bias, and then they come together to discussion the candidates so no one can be pressured into picking a candidate.

**Col Giezie:** We have that process in our Merit placement plan, we picked that up from the private sector and that is not something we are used to seeing.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** Maybe going back to hiring and selection for key leaders maybe we need to relook at this and see how much leeway we have to make some significant change within our organization.

**SGM Jones:** We do not just need to look at upward mobility with key positions. We also need to look at left and right, career management is not always up and down. We need to make sure we are doing our best by getting our best and brightest in multiple positions and it may not mean necessarily mean upward mobility.

**COL Shears:** I had the same thought with career enhancement not necessarily upward.

**SGM Jones:** Looking at career management for example being in different type of Platoon SGT in different areas makes the Soldiers more marketable.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** On Page 36 Appendix D, that whole section is probably going to have to be re-written to add in Title 5 because that doesn't have any information about Title 5.

**Col Giezie:** You are correct we wrote that for purely military but we will need to add them both in

**MG Harris:** All the places that say proppant there is only one, because I go to that one person.

**Maj Gen Bartman:** If you want to try and go through the entire plan and rework it to add in remarks. We can send it out in a few weeks, we may need to get back together here in early Nov. to go through this again in order to hammer out all the details, at least before Thanksgiving.

#### **ONG JDISP:**

**Maj Gen Bartman:** We need to decide here, is this something we want to no kidding if we stop mentoring and using other terminology. I think this will be revolutionary. I want to make sure before we rock the foundation we need to make sure this right course of action.

**MG Harris:** Mentorship programs has a negative connotation because of all of the failures.

**SGM Jones:** It's a voluntary program how you can mandate a voluntary program.



**Maj Gen Bartman:** it is in Army and Air Force doctrine but even if we simply change the terminology and explain what it means. I would like everyone to think about this until we meet again so we can discuss how to roll that out.

**ONG Discrimination Complaints:**

Should be completed today, it is with MG Harris.

**Full Time Force Hiring Trends:**

No remarks

**Ohio National Guard Female Techs Army and Air:**

No Remarks

**Ohio National Guard Racial Minority Techs Army and Air:** Packet being put together for the trends within the last FY.

**CODI Recommendations:**

**MSG White:** I was hoping to reach out to the CoS and Director of staff, and ask them to maybe use their have influence to have them get people to participate in CODI.

**COL Shears:** - Can you send me a charter for the CODI and what you are looking for?

**Col Giezie:** When we get outside of Beightler they do not understand what the CODI really is. The people who are members have been great but they don't know much about it and what we are actually doing on our end. Maybe we can make some sort of appointment letter for Maj Gen Bartman to sign?

**Maj Gen Bartman:** I like an appointment letter idea and I would be happy to sign in.

**Col Giezie:** While we are talking about participation, I want to mention Recruiting and Retention. They really need to be here and we have not had a great amount of participation and they need to understand our objectives and have visibility on this.

**MG Harris** I just want to be careful because any effort has to be increase the force.

**Col Giezie:** Strategically what can we be doing smarter to bring in and increase the numbers in those areas? This is the marketing side of it.

**TAG/JDEC Guidance & Direction:**

No Comments

**Final/ Closing Remarks:**

**Maj Gen Bartman:** The article from New York Times is with your paperwork so if you have time, you should look over the responses that came back from that article.