

**INTERSTATE COMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR MILITARY  
CHILDREN HAWAII STATE COUNCIL  
GENERAL BUSINESS MEETING**

**Brig Gen (Ret) Kathleen Berg, Hawaii State Commissioner**

**Via WebEx Meeting**

**Tuesday, July 19, 2021**

**9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

**MINUTES**

Attendance:

Council Members Present:

- Maj Ryan McHugh for Col Daniel Misigoy, Commander, U.S. Army Garrison-Hawaii (USAG-HI)
- Col Speros Koumparakis, Commander, Marine Corps Base Hawaii (MCBH)
- Col Angenene Roberston, J1, U.S. Indo-Pacific Command (USINDOPACOM)
- Brig Gen (Ret) Kathleen Berg, State Commissioner, Hawaii State Council, MIC3
- CDR Matt ten Berge, Resources Division Officer, U.S. Coast Guard (US CG) 14<sup>th</sup> District
- CAS Robert Davis, Complex Area Superintendent, Central: Leilehua-Mililani-Waialua, HIDOE
- CAS John Erickson, Complex Area Superintendent, Central: Aiea-Moanalua-Radford, HIDOE; also representing Dr. Christina Kishimoto, Superintendent, HIDOE
- CAS Lanelle Hibbs, Complex Area Superintendent, Kailua-Kalaheo, HIDOE
- Ms. Wendy Nakasone-Kalani, School Liaison Officer, Hawaii Education Liaison Officers Council (HELOC)
- CAS Sean Tajima, Complex Area Superintendent, Leeward: Campbell-Kapolei, HIDOE
- Mr. Raymond Fujino, Executive Director, Oahu Interscholastic Association
- Ms. Cherry Okahara, Military Liaison, HIDOE
- Mr. Scott Fuji for Senator Michelle Kidani, Hawaii State Legislature

Unable to Attend:

- CAPT Darren Guenther, Chief of Staff, Navy Region Hawaii
- Col Tammie Harris, Commander, Hickam Air Force Base, 647<sup>th</sup> Airbase Group/Deputy Joint Base Commander
- Governor David Ige
- Representative Justin Woodson, Hawaii State Legislature

1. Call to Order: 9:01 a.m.

2. Welcome/Farewell:

Commissioner Berg thanked the members for their attendance and announced four invited guests who had not yet joined the WebEx meeting:

- MIC3 Executive Director Cherise Imai, who would be interrupting her fishing vacation in Alaska to join us for a presentation from the MIC3 National Offices
- Col Sharon Stehlik, Air Force Reserve Advisor to the Commander USINDOPACOM, who was appointed by Col Robertson as the point of contact for the State Council's data collection efforts on the Selected Reserve forces stationed in Hawaii.
- Col Regina Komine, Commander, 154th Mission Support Group, Hawaii Air National Guard, who helped with data collection from the Air National Guard
- COL Pam Ellison, Human Resources, Hawaii Army National Guard, who also helped with data collection on the Army National Guard

She welcomed all the other guests, noting that at the end of the meeting there would be a public comment period during which they were welcome to participate.

3. Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes: Due to word processing program mismatches, the minutes from the May 11, 2021 meeting were not available for review. Arrangements were made for their distribution at a later date. In lieu of meeting minutes, Commissioner Berg did an oral summary of the previous meeting topics and discussion, much of which would be talked about again at this meeting prior to making the decisions required to develop the state's position on the National Guard and Reserve issue. She noted that members were sent as a handout for the current meeting the same *MIC3 State Commissioner Guidance: Developing a State Position on the National Guard and Reserve* handout that was used before to guide the state council's work so that a state report can be completed by August and submitted to the MIC3 National Office to help with planning for the upcoming 2021 Annual Business Meeting (ABM).

4. Old Business:

a. Military Family Education Liaison: Members were sent the updated description for the MFEL position on the Hawaii State Council, and they were asked to help with recruiting someone to fill our now vacant position.

b. Develop State Position on Coverage for All National Guard and Reserve Members:

(1) Presentation by Military Interstate Children's Compact Commission (MIC3) on Issue and Options:

MIC3 Executive Director Cherise Imai joined the virtual Hawaii State Council meeting to share a slide presentation that had been used in many Interstate Compact member states to help their state councils better understand the full context of the task that each state had been asked to undertake: to develop that state's position on Compact coverage for all National Guard and Reserve (NGR) members, in preparation for the next MIC3 ABM (in November 2021) at which state commissioners will be asked to vote on the various courses of action that had been proposed by the MIC3 Executive Committee. ED Imai thanked the Council for the opportunity to work with Hawaii State Council members, her former friends and colleagues. She shared that from the presentations she had made around the country, state councils had expressed very different opinions and she really did not have a firm idea of what would come out at the ABM.

As the first slide expressed, the main question was, "Should the Compact be expanded to include dependents of the National Guard and Reserve beyond Title 10?" Using the slides, ED Imai described how members of the Guard and Reserve on active duty orders are covered now by the eligibility definitions (in Chapter 100) and as well as some rules related to deployments (in Chapter 600). She described the background of the issue and how one state (Utah) unilaterally changed their Compact law, which is against Compact rules, and put their membership at risk. The work with Utah on that issue led to convening in spring 2019 the ad hoc National Guard and Reserve Coverage Task Force (NGRTF), charged to collect and analyze relevant data in order to make recommendations about expanding Compact coverage already in place for these Selected Reserve members when on Title 10 status to members in other status situations, as well.

She summarized some points from the Task Force Interim Report at the 2019 Annual Business Meeting (presented by Hawaii Commissioner Berg as chair of the Task Force). Points from that preliminary report that were emphasized by ED Imai included the information about what some states (Kentucky and Arkansas) had already done related to expansion of Compact coverage through state statutes that are separate and external to those states' Compact laws, as well as concerns regarding the fiscal impact on member states should the Task Force recommend and the Commission act to expand Compact coverage.

She described the 2020 NGR Survey of States that the Task Force asked the MIC3 National Office to conduct to collect data on states' interactions with the NGR and Compact cases involving NGR children. She noted that Utah's actions had prompted letters from the Reserve Officers Association and the Enlisted Association of the National Guard that were sent in 2019 to MIC3 in support of expanded Compact coverage. She then summarized the NGRTF's final recommendation and understandings presented at the 2020 ABM as part of their final report. The Task Force supported expansion of Compact coverage to all members of the Selected Reserve—including Traditional, Active/Guard Reserve, and Military Technician (Dual Status) members—for moves related to changes in duty station and for

deployments in any active-duty status, including Title 10, Title 32, and State Active duty (SAD). *It was understood that* (1) the rules change process cannot change applicability, (2) an amendment to the Compact requires unanimous consent of member states, (3) states may not unilaterally amend their Compact statute, and (4) some states have enacted separate and external statutes to extend coverage.

The report also provided to state commissioners three charts showing by state the numbers of Active Duty (AD), National Guard and Reserve (NGR), and AD+NGR sponsors and school-age children by service component; the charts also listed current state dues based on AD numbers as well as possible dues increases if expanding coverage to NGR families warranted such an increase in cost to member states.

ED Imai explained that there was much discussion at the 2020 ABM, a few states in full support and other states expressing concerns. Ultimately the Commission did not adopt the Task Force recommendation, and ED Imai explained that most of the commissioners wanted to discuss it with their state councils and stakeholders and take up the issue at the following year's ABM. There were concerns about possible dues increases with the addition of the NGR dependents, and the result was referral of the item to the Executive Committee. ED Imai noted that any possible dues increase was really an issue separate from the expansion of coverage.

Accomplishing expanded coverage would not automatically mean an increase states' dues. Any dues increase would have to be voted on separately and done through a by-law change to change the dues formula.

The result of the referral to the Executive Committee was the four-page guidance document developed for commissioners and state councils to help them understand and consider options for action at the next ABM. ED Imai had presented the slides to over 20 state councils and distributed them to even more states. She said that reactions had run the gamut of possibilities, so she had no clear idea of what the outcome would be at the 2021 ABM. For some states the question of dues was just a show stopper regardless of the explanation she provided, which was that (1) expansion of the Compact to cover reserve component children was not an opportunity to increase revenue to the Commission—more money is not really needed; (2) inclusion of reserve component children should be accomplished without an increase in dues, if at all possible; and (3) courses of action to amend the Compact to include reserve component children would require a change to the dues formula to ensure that state dues are not increased, and that would be a separate process—a by-laws change. She had a slide tailored to Hawaii's dues amount and numbers of active duty and reserve component sponsors and school-age dependents. With a rank of #10 for AD sponsor numbers and #33 for NGR sponsor numbers, Hawaii would be in the middle of the group in terms of impact *if* the Compact were amended and a dues increase *had* to be made for some unforeseen reason: based on 2020 DoD data, sponsors would go from 44,613 AD to 55,722 with the addition of 5,301 NGR members and school-age dependents from 17,921 to 23,222 with the

addition of 7,898 NGR dependents. If the dues formula was not changed and, in spite of there being relatively few reserve component families who actually do move, the state was asked to pay the same dues for NGR as AD children, who we know move a lot, the dues increase would be 44%, from \$20,609 to \$29,692. ED Imai then presented the five possible courses of action that states were to consider: (1) amend the Compact statute, (2) amend state codes outside the Compact, (3) create an “enhanced Compact”; (4) adopt a memorandum of agreement (MOA), (5) take no action at this time. The guideline document contains some of the same pros and cons for each option that she presented, but she was able to add the approximate cost to accomplish each option as well.

- **COA #1: Amend the Compact Statute: Pro:** Extend Compact coverage to all NGR dependents beyond Title 10 in the Compact. **Con:** The language would need to be adopted in statute by all 50 + 1 members before the coverage would be active; cost to the Commission to fund this effort; time to work with states to pass the language; risk other unapproved modifications to the Compact statute. **Note:** Could state legislatures adopt an “administrative amendment” that clarifies that the Compact shall be applied to all children of military families? **Fiscal cost:** \$761,000
- **COA #2: Amend State Codes Outside the Compact: Pro:** States could choose to do this independently; would be in effect immediately upon passage; would not increase state dues as it is outside of the Compact. **Con:** Would not be uniform across all member states. **Note:** Examples of separate, external language that extends Compact coverage to all NGR children, regardless of title, available from Arkansas. **Fiscal cost:** \$2000.
- **COA #3: Create an “Enhanced Compact”:** Include the additional language to extend coverage. The enhanced and original compacts would bind states that join the enhanced compact, but only the current compact would bind states that choose not to join (ref. The Nursing Compact). **Pro:** States that wish to join the enhanced compact could do so, but no state would be required to. **Con:** The enhancement risks becoming too broad; states may choose to add measures that other states choose not to include; would the current staff be sufficient to administer both compacts; might complicate the dues formula if not all states join the enhanced compact. **Fiscal cost:** \$3,000 – \$5,000
- **COA #4: Adopt a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA):** The appropriate official in each state (governor, chief state school officer) could sign an MOA developed by the Commission. The MOA would indicate that the signatory states would treat children of reserve component families as though the Compact covers them. Reserve component children would not be counted for calculating dues. **Pro:** Avoids issues of compliance raised by amending the compact statutes; requires no change to dues formula. **Con:** Could be canceled by the same official who entered the MOA; might expire after a given period of time. **Fiscal cost:** \$3,000 – \$8,000

- **COA #5: Take No Action At This Time:** A member state may feel no further action by the Commission is necessary at this time. Some states expressed the Compact was developed by the USDOD to address education challenges encountered by active-duty children who move frequently based on their parents' assignments—and covers the children that need to be covered. **Pro:** Would not require further action by the Commission. The dependents of National Guard and Reserve under Title 10 would continue to be covered under the Compact. **Fiscal cost:** None

ED Imai then outlined the next steps for the Hawaii State Council, consistent with those described on the last page of the guidance document handout: (1) seek state specific National Guard and Reserve data; (2) develop the position of your state council; (3) each state must submit a written report to the Commission by August 31, 2021 with the state council's position and why, and include any questions or concerns, or request clarification. The item will be included in the docket for discussion at the 2021 ABM, and the state commissioner is to be prepared to discuss and vote on behalf of their state.

Commissioner Berg thanked ED Imai for the comprehensive review of the issues at hand and the clear presentation of next steps for us. She basically outlined the rest of the council meeting. Before launching into the task, however, Commissioner Berg invited attendees to ask any questions they wanted to of ED Imai. There were no questions, so the group moved on to the first of the three next steps: seek state specific National Guard and Reserve data.

#### (2) Preliminary Report on Data Collection of Relevant Interstate Moves In Hawaii:

Before reporting out on the data collected for the task, Commissioner Berg thanked the folks who did the job for us, starting with Col Angenene Robertson, J1 at USINDOPACOM who pointed Commissioner Berg in the direction of Col Sharon Stehlik, Air Force Reserve Advisor to the Commander, USINDOPACOM who set up contacts with the Navy Reserve and Army Reserve, and served, herself, as the contact for the Air Force Reserve. That left the Coast Guard Reserve, and Commissioner Berg used personal contacts on the Council for access to them. She also had great help from the National Guard: BG (Ret) Bruce Oliveira with the Hawaii Army National Guard, who is also a member of JVEF worked with her, as well as did the Commander of the Mission Support Group at the 154 Wing of the Hawaii Air National Guard, now Col Regina Komine. COL Pam Ellison, Hawaii Army National Guard Human Resources Officer also collected needed data. Col Komine had joined the online meeting, and was invited to share any information she wished with the Council regarding data collected from the Air National Guard. She was still working on it and would contribute later in the meeting.

Commissioner Berg did have data from the Air Force Reserve: in Hawaii there were 57 military members with 117 school-age children who had been affected over the

last year by interstate moves. When Col Stehlik drilled down to see what status they were in, she discovered Traditional Reserve members, Active Guard Reserve (AGR), and Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs). Their duty status was either Title 10 or AGR, which can be either Title 10 or Title 32. More detail is needed regarding the AGRs. It is known that the AGRs in the state's National Guard units are all Title 32, but the AGRs in the Air Force Reserve can be either Title 32 or Title 10 depending on what work they are doing—if the mission they are supporting on orders is an active duty or reserve mission. Since the Air Force Reserve works so closely with the Air Force, much of their active duty is Title 10 so they are covered by the Compact. So the problem of dependents not being covered falls mostly with the National Guard members. Col Stehlik indicated that the Air Force Reserve in Hawaii does not generally track interstate moves, so obtaining this information on how many sponsors and children had moved involved a great deal of extra work. The Navy Reserve contact was still working on their data collection, and it was not known whether the Army Reserve had collected data yet or not. The Army Reserve in Hawaii is the largest of the Reserve Components in Hawaii, next is the Army National Guard, followed by the Air National Guard. The data collection within the National Guard components was underway but not yet complete.

Commissioner Berg shared a conversation she had with BG (Ret) Bruce Oliveira wherein he told her that our Army National Guard kids in Hawaii did suffer quite a bit when there were large numbers of Army Guard troops mobilized and deployed to the desert. He was struck by the difficulties that so many of the children had when their parent was away. When they talked about what the Interstate Compact does for military kids, he noted that hardly any of these local kids changed schools during that time but lots of them had issues, most stemming from worry about their mom or dad military sponsor away in a combat zone. So in Hawaii there were serious needs that National Guard families had connected to the sponsor's military duty. These needs that are not covered by the Compact or the military services for NGR, although such needs are covered by active duty on-base programs that support military youth, which are not readily available to NGR children even when their parents are on Title 10 active duty. So that when she and BG Oliveira talked about the course of action options, the example of the Arkansas state law was of interest since it includes, besides the expanded Compact coverage to NGR, a mandate that any public school with 20 or more military children, including NGR children, will have a military liaison in the school to keep track of those kids to see if they are having social or emotional issues as well as academic issues because a parent was deployed. So that could be something that Hawaii might be interested in doing and that the National Guard here would support—a state law that helped created more support for *all* of the military kids in the state's schools.

Col Komine of the Hawaii Air National Guard came back online and shared the data she had collected: over just the last year 2020, only 7 children from 3 families had been affected by interstate moves. She was still waiting for 2019 data to see if

COVID had any affect, but she did not expect the numbers to be larger. They do *not* have a lot of people who move out of state in any year. She said that something to keep in mind, however, is that the Hawaii Air Guard had converted numerous Military Technician positions to AGRs so she surmised that there may be a very small uptick over the next three years, but she didn't think it would ever be more than about 3 or 4 families every year, if that. These AGRs are all on Title 32 orders that are usually for periods of 3 years or less. Commissioner Berg commented that when looking at the total NGR situation, the Army and Air National Guard organizations are much more state-centric. Members actually have to resign from one state's NG organization to join another's. Whereas, if you look at the Navy Reserve or Air Force or Army Reserve, it is a much more service centric notion. Lots of the Reserve members are individuals put on orders who leave their families where they are and just go do their duty and come back; they are used to doing that long-distance service and would likely go somewhere else for their next duty assignment. National Guard units were designed to train and be mobilized as units with much less movement of members state to state than the Reserve units have. The Reservists belong to units and train with units, but individual mobilizations are the norm and are easily accommodated by units. Guard members are much more integral parts of their units and are expected to be present and active with them during regular and frequent training periods. It is difficult to live in one state and be a successful member of a Guard unit in another, and travel expenses are all borne by the member, not provided by the military. So Reserve members tend to accommodate long-distance service, but if a Traditional Guard member's full-time (civilian) job involved a move to another state, the family would more likely move and the member leave the Guard there and then try to join a Guard unit in another state. AGRs more easily move from state to state. They are full-time military and stationed for three-year periods with National Guard units, often serving many years in the same place, three years at a time, but they can more easily move to another AGR position in another state than can the Military Technicians who are technically Traditional Guard members and also Federal Civilian employees. They are the other category of Full-time Support in the Air and Army Guard as well as in the Air Force and Army Reserve that are slowly being converted to AGR. Because AGRs are like active duty military only on Title 32, management of AGRs is much easier than dealing with the very complex Military Technician programs, although AGRs cost more than MILTECHS. Note that it was the moves of the family of an Air Force Reserve MILTECH that kicked off the Utah amendment of their state law that resulted in formation of the MIC3 National Guard and Reserve Coverage Task Force and the big push to expand Compact coverage to all the Selected Reserve members. Suffice it to say, there are different cultures and different personnel management challenges between the Guard and Reserve organizations, and the Active Duty Services.



Commissioner Berg then reviewed the databases that the Task Force received from the National Guard Bureau showing details of the interstate moves during the 6 months between October 2019 and March 2020 for both the Army and Air Guard members. For each branch there were about 900 members who changed states. The Army Guard database had enough detail to reveal that the 900 moves involved Traditional (over 800 of them), AGR (about 50), and MILTECH members (7 of them). Of the 900 members, there were data on dependents of about 650 of them, so it could be determined that fewer than 200 dependents were possibly involved in interstate moves. One couldn't tell if all of them were school-age children or if they even moved to another state when the member's assignment was changed to another state, but they represented families of only 100 of those 650 Army Guard members. By boiling all the numbers down and extrapolating from a generous estimate of 2000 as the number of Army Guard members who usually move from one state to another in a year (and using 327,449 from the 2018 DOD data book as the total number of soldiers in the Army Guard), the estimate was made that fewer than 1% of the total number of members of the Army National Guard make an interstate move to change duty location in any year. Using the Army National Guard as a representative sample of the total NGR population, it was easy to see that raising Compact dues to accommodate coverage for fewer than 1% of the members (fewer than 8,000 additional military members, which is 1% of the 800,000 total Selected Reserve population) could not be justified. Commissioner Berg summed up by saying that the demand for coverage was very small in terms of numbers, but really important in terms of the effect on those particular families, and that fact increased the pressure to meet this demand. This brought the meeting to the start of a discussion to develop the Hawaii State Council's position on the NGR issue.

### (3) Discussion to Establish Hawaii State Council Position on the National Guard and Reserve:

To begin the conversation, Commissioner Berg shared that in discussions with the local National Guard folks, the group leaned toward supporting local, Hawaii state legislation to extend the coverage to Traditional and all active duty of any kind—Title 10, Title 32, and State Active Duty (SAD)—for any of those families whose children who have to change schools because their military sponsors duty location was changed. She explained that generally, Guard members do not get orders to, for example, move from the Hawaii Air National Guard to the Texas Guard; they officially leave the Hawaii Air Guard and then join the Texas Guard. So there are not “PCS orders” in the National Guard, but there are changes to where members serve their duty obligations, so the language cannot be quite the same or as precise as it is with Active Duty.

Along with the state offering coverage for those who come in and out of Hawaii schools, a Hawaii law could require identifying military liaisons in those schools

that have National Guard and Reserve kids in them. And because of the ESSA federal law, Hawaii schools should already have a military student identifier for all those NGR children in the public schools. Schools should already know where they are located. When Commissioner Berg talked with BG (Ret) Oliveira, he made a note to have added to the processing steps for soldiers who are activated, a step that would ask those soldiers where their children attend school. And then at the very least the local family support groups in the Guard could make the schools aware that they had attending in their schools children whose moms or dads were deployed. This provision could be put in a separate law from our state Compact law and worked on with JVEF and the HIDEOE. With only one big school district in the state, changes can be effected very quickly.

Commissioner Berg added that beyond creating state legislation, the option of signing on to an MOA that was established by MIC3 to extend coverage to NGR also had support. She noted that a lot of the Reserve members are already covered, since they are generally on Title 10 orders when they are on full-time orders; it is the National Guard that are not covered and left out even on orders. But our Hawaii National Guard deserves to be covered.

CAS Lanelle Hibbs expressed support for Course of Action (COA) #2, Amend State Codes Outside the Compact. There were subsequent comments on the pros and cons of the five proposed COAs that further elaborated on those in the presentation given by Executive Director Imai at the start of the meeting. Col Robertson commented on what was said about COA #5: she found it interesting that some or one state decided to take care of the issue on their own. She wondered what that meant and what it looked like. They seemed to have cracked the code on how to go about taking care of families in their state without any additional support or advocacy outside of just that state. She asked if Commissioner Berg was tracking any additional data on that.

Commissioner Berg responded that those data would be difficult to track. Then she harkened back to 2008–2009 in Hawaii when the state was asked to join the Compact. The initial response was that Hawaii did not need the Compact because the state takes care of the military children here very well on its own. What was brought to Hawaii's attention—and to the attention of all the 51 potential signators to the Compact was that it was really important to have agreements between states because the biggest problems came with kids who were seniors when their military parent was transferred and they had to change schools in their senior year. And, at that time, lots of them did **not** graduate, **unless** the two schools worked together. And having the force of law that would mandate that cooperation was really necessary to prevent the horror stories that were regularly heard about military children's experiences. That was the most powerful thing about having the Compact be an interstate agreement. She talked about how the principal at Kalaheo High School, prior to the Compact, used to regularly send Hawaii high school diplomas to military kids who had to transfer to Texas during their senior year and take the

Texas competency test to graduate from a high school there. So there were ways to establish cooperation, but no way to guarantee it would happen or to monitor that it happened or to do something in time to prevent horror stories before the Compact with its infrastructure of state commissioners, state councils, compliance enforcement, etc. Hawaii with its single school district really would not even need a state law to expand coverage; it could be done via HIDOE policy. Perhaps that is now sufficient in other states where taking care of active duty families is now established practice. She reflected that not having coverage be part of the whole Compact with its force of law and relying just on an MOA or even states doing their own thing via their separate laws would be kind of second class treatment for NGR. The Compact law provides a safety net for all kids in all states. The MOA is close. There being no other comments, Commissioner Berg noted that the state report due to MIC3 in August also needed to include any concerns or issues that were part of the COA discussion, and she asked that any other comments or concerns to be included be sent to her. Those identified in the discussion could be the question of sufficiency for just an MOA or having states just do their own thing without any interstate agreements. Also noted was that the Compact does not solve a lot of the social/emotional or even academic problems that NGR students have when a parent is deployed.

Additional comments were solicited. Then Commissioner Berg agreed to draft a state report and share it to get feedback. Due date for the report was the end of August.

## 5. New Business

a. Request for Topics/Issues for 2021 Annual Business Meeting of Military Interstate Children's Compact Commission (MIC3), November 4–5: Commissioner Berg asked if there were any items the State Council members wanted brought to the attention of the Commission. The ABM was to be held in Little Rock, Arkansas. Whether she would attend in-person or virtually she had not yet decided. To date the National Office had announced that they would host an in-person meeting in Little Rock but also provide a virtual option for attendees. HIDOE Military Liaison Okahara said she intended to attend virtually unless she got other guidance from HIDOE leadership. Registration for the ABM had not yet been opened by the time of this State Council meeting.

### b. Other Comments or Questions:

Commissioner Berg opened the floor and solicited comments or questions on any topic for the Council. Military Liaison Okahara solicited comments or questions specifically from the Council's military stakeholders, then from the HIDOE Complex Area Superintendents and others. Commissioner Berg raised the question of whether there had been requests from military families to HIDOE for a virtual school option as the date drew near for the start of in-person schooling for the 2021–22 school year.

CAS Hibbs responded that within the Windward Complex she had heard of no requests for distance learning from military families. She said families had been requesting a return to in-person schooling for months. She commented that, as usual, they would serve families on a case-by-case basis, just as they did last year, should there be requests for distance learning; they didn't want to jeopardize any student's getting their requirements finished. But to date no schools in the complex were expecting it.

CAS Davis of Central Complex, Leilehua-Mililani-Waiialua, reiterated the points made by CAS Hibbs, including the case-by-case support for individual requests for distance learning. He noted that the scope and sequence for distance learning options were usually much different than the in-person courses at the secondary level, so that for a student who was to leave the state mid-term and requested to finish the term via distance learning, there would be challenges. He noted that there would be second and third level consequences to doing that and those should be considered before any blanket statements about doing that were made. He mentioned that the state was offering distance learning and had set its course at the Board of Education meeting the week prior. Although it was not being required of every school, he said every complex should have some kind of offering, and that's why it was important to realize that it was being handled case-by-case. For the military in general, he said that there had been a small number requesting it, but overall the military community in general had always been pushing for face-to-face a lot more rigorously than many of our local communities.

CAS Tajima for Leeward Complex, Campbell-Kapolei, echoed the comments made by CAS Hibbs and CAS Davis: they were handling it on a case-by-case basis. If parents leave or kids leave in the middle of the school year, they definitely did not want that to hurt their chances of graduation. Just like the year before when they accommodated a military family, they were willing to consider requests again on a case-by-case basis as well.

CAS Ericson of Central Complex, Aiea-Moanalua-Radford reiterated what the other CASs said. For them it was a case-by-case basis for considering distance learning, and all the calls he had been getting were for in-person learning full-time. He was not getting any requests for distance learning options. Everyone was excited to get the kids back safely. He said there may be some who have medical needs and they would want to support them, but for the most part they would be up and running with full operations.

Commissioner Berg thanked the CASs for filling her in on the Hawaii context, since she thought that the issue would likely come up at the ABM. Military Liaison Okahara assured Commissioner Berg that as the ABM date got closer, she would check in with the CASs to find out if there was anything new that they wanted her to bring up at the ABM in November. Commissioner Berg noted that Kindergarten entry was the usual issue for Hawaii and she had heard nothing about it this year, for a change.

6. Next State Council Meeting: Commissioner Berg said unless some big issue came up, no meeting would be expected before the ABM, so next meeting date was TBD.

7. Public Comment (5 min per individual):

There were no public comments.

In closing, Military Liaison Okahara said that the messages in the WebEx chat box indicated that everyone was in agreement and trusted Commissioner Berg to do the write-up. Council members and other attendees chimed in with comments in agreement. Others expressed confidence in the State Council and other attendees. Commissioner Berg thanked everyone for their vote of confidence and said she would get the report draft out as soon as she could get the rest of the data being collected, so the Council would have data-driven decisions. Special recognition was given to CAS Hibbs and Ray Fujino for using their video and showing their faces during nearly the whole meeting, so that the meeting moderators Berg and Okahara had people to talk to instead of just dots on the screen. A special mahalo for their attendance was sent out to Col Koumparakis, Maj McHugh, and Col Robertson from the military. Scott Fuji from Senator Kidani's office was recognized as were others in attendance who were not members of the Council—Tamsin Keoni, Cherise Castro, Don Christensen, Elaine Daly-Rath, and Jean Grice. As several attendees turned on their video feeds to show smiling faces, final expressions of appreciation were shared and the meeting adjourned.

8. Meeting was adjourned at 10:26 a.m.

Point of Contact: Brig Gen (Ret) Kathleen Berg  
Hawaii State Commissioner  
Email: [kberg@hawaii.edu](mailto:kberg@hawaii.edu)  
Phone: 808-778-2157