



## 2020 MIC3 Commissioner National Guard and Reserve Survey Results

In July 2020, the NGRTF distributed the 2020 MIC3 Commissioner National Guard and Reserve Survey to obtain feedback and insights from the member states through their Compact Commissioners and Designees.

Thirty-four or 79% of Commissioners completed the survey and those results are outlined below.

- Responded (34): AK, AZ, AR, CO, DE, FL, GA, HI, ID, KS, KY, LA, ME, MD, MA, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NM, NY, ND, OH, OK, OR, RI, SC, TN, UT, VA, WA, WI, WY
- Did not respond (9): AL, CT, IL, MN, NJ, SD, TX, VT, WV
- Commissioner Vacancy (8): CA, DC, IN, IA, MI, MS, NC, PA

Note: Question #1 asked each participant to identify themselves by first and last name, and the state they represent as the Compact Commissioner. The results will begin with Question #2 and #3, which were open-ended questions allowing Commissioners to expand on their response.

**Question #2: As a Commissioner, approximately how many Compact cases do you encounter annually? (This information will be used to gauge case levels in member states.)**

State	Responses/Comments
<b>Alaska</b>	Five.
<b>Arizona</b>	3
<b>Arkansas</b>	four to six cases annually.
<b>Colorado</b>	15-Oct
<b>Delaware</b>	1 or 2 at most
<b>Florida</b>	I personally deal with 10 to 15 per year. Many are solved at lower levels, or with the help of School Liaison Officers.
<b>Georgia</b>	Personally, I became involved in approximately 7 this year which was my first year as a commissioner. I believe the SLOs handled far more at the local level.
<b>Hawaii</b>	As state commissioner, I usually handle just a few cases each year, perhaps 3 or 4 in an average school year these days. Hawaii has lots of military students transferring in and out of the state public schools every year, so our school people are very familiar with military students and their needs. We have SLOs for all the services on Oahu, the population center of the state. The state's schools make up a single district, so the system is very connected and accessible, and it has a full-time employee who serves as the department of education military liaison. Consequently, issues are usually resolved at the school level, or with the help of SLOs and the HIDOE military liaison. Sometimes a complex superintendent will be consulted, and they may call me to confer. Thus, very few Compact cases ever reach the level of the state commissioner. Sometimes, not often, I'll be contacted directly by a parent who may or may not have conferred with the school or others beforehand.
<b>Idaho</b>	3-5
<b>Kansas</b>	3
<b>Kentucky</b>	Five
<b>Louisiana</b>	5
<b>Maine</b>	We have less than 5 cases each year.
<b>Maryland</b>	10-20
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Four to Six cases annually
<b>Missouri</b>	On average, 4 cases.
<b>Montana</b>	We are lucky in Montana. Leadership in various schools that have some impact are very "seasoned" dealing with the issues. About 15 cases total. Generally, issues have dealt with the unit or individual activation. A phone call to the superintendent and family members solves the problem. Since I was a longtime educator, and with three years of DOD teaching, and attained rank of BG in the Army Guard, issues tend to "melt quickly." Examples: Student goes to small community to live with grandparents. Student has special needs or is an honor student. A call gets things on track - about 3 of these per year.
<b>Nebraska</b>	Less than 1 case per year

<b>Nevada</b>	Around 1 per year, down from around 3 or 4 per year since we changed graduation requirements 4 years ago when the high school proficiency exams were removed as a requirement for graduation.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	6
<b>New Mexico</b>	I have handled one case in the past year.
<b>New York</b>	NY 12
<b>North Dakota</b>	3-8
<b>Ohio</b>	As you can imagine, it varies quite broadly and what is the exact, full definition of "case." If it is referred to me by our School Liaison Officer, or local educators, or Purple Star School Liaisons, or U.S. DoD personnel, or I am connected with a family directly - and I support the now-local family and school with the details, protections of the MIC3 state law. It can be approx. 55 to 75 connections, annually. This is not including non-active duty components. Or state leaders requesting specific counsel and guidance, on the parameters of the MIC3 state law. Is it resolved with one, person to person call or email, more extensive support via emails, multiple calls and connections, and looping in other colleagues, entities on the local region, community? This is our shared mission. Always between the arts and the sciences - but of course, that has been the "case" even before MIC3's first state laws were enacted in 2008 and 2009.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	20
<b>Oregon</b>	One
<b>Rhode Island</b>	Zero to two a year. All resolved by SLO.
<b>South Carolina</b>	Most cases are usually resolved at the local level; however this past school year we had 6-7.
<b>Tennessee</b>	10-20
<b>Utah</b>	1-2
<b>Virginia</b>	10 Compact related cases on average.
<b>Washington</b>	average 6 but over the years as many as 12
<b>Wisconsin</b>	1-3
<b>Wyoming</b>	Average of about two a year.

**Question #3: Since 2017, approximately how many of your Compact cases involved a National Guard or Reserve dependent? Provide a brief summary of the case(s).**

<b>State</b>	<b>Responses/Comments</b>
<b>Alaska</b>	Since being designated (2019), the cases I have encountered did not involve National Guard/Reserve.
<b>Arizona</b>	None that I am aware of.
<b>Arkansas</b>	None
<b>Colorado</b>	N/A
<b>Delaware</b>	none
<b>Florida</b>	I cannot recall any.
<b>Georgia</b>	I have been commissioner for one year so I can only speak to the last year. None of the cases I am aware of dealt with National Guard or Reserve families.
<b>Hawaii</b>	I do not remember ever having a case that involved a National Guard or Reserve dependent. I have heard of only one case in Hawaii, and that was just a single inquiry to the HIDEOE military liaison a few years ago from a Reserve officer on full-time duty orders who was moving from Hawaii to DC.
<b>Idaho</b>	0
<b>Kansas</b>	0
<b>Kentucky</b>	None
<b>Louisiana</b>	Very few.
<b>Maine</b>	We have had no cases involving a National Guard or Reserve dependent.
<b>Maryland</b>	0
<b>Massachusetts</b>	None
<b>Missouri</b>	No cases involving National Guard or Reserves.
<b>Montana</b>	We are very lucky in Montana. Leadership in various schools that have some impact are very seasoned in dealing with the issues. About 5 - 10 cases per year.
<b>Nebraska</b>	None
<b>Nevada</b>	None.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	NH has not had any cases that involved the Guard or the Reserves
<b>New Mexico</b>	None.

<b>New York</b>	NY one, they wanted an IDEA change but had not relocated. The IEP for the student was appropriate.
<b>North Dakota</b>	Not many because the compact doesn't assist. Everything done is on a personal basis
<b>Ohio</b>	Annually, there are always dozens of cases that are centric to National Guard moves, school transitions (well outside active duty orders, formal PCS). I always initially share with these Military families, K-12 education colleagues whom are school counselors and principals, etc -- the "letter" of the MIC3 law, and the "spirit" of the law.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	2
<b>Oregon</b>	None. Although our council has discussed some national guard issues generally.
<b>Rhode Island</b>	None
<b>South Carolina</b>	NA
<b>Tennessee</b>	3-4
<b>Utah</b>	0
<b>Virginia</b>	Two cases. The first case involved an intrastate transition from Hampton Roads to Fairfax County, Virginia. Student was a rising Junior who was having difficulty enrolling in an upper level course. Since the student's parent was in the Virginia National Guard (VNG) and was active under title 10 orders I was able to work with the receiving school division and advocate on placement in course so student could stay on track programmatically.  The second case involved a single mother, VNG soldier who was deployed and whose daughter was placed in the care of grandparents. The school system had questions regarding enrollment since grandmother did not have custody of the student but did have a power of attorney from the VNG parent. Since this parent was on active duty orders I was able to educate the school division on the flexibility under the compact permitting enrollment with a military power of attorney in cases where the parent is deployed and has placed the child in the care of family.
<b>Washington</b>	None that I'm aware of
<b>Wisconsin</b>	? 1 Family relocating due to a deployment and did not want the child to attend the school district where they were located.  When anyone who contacts me from the Guard and Reserve, I do not record this as a case as they are not under the Compact. This work is on my own. Maybe this question needs to be asked in a different way such as: How many Guard/Reserve members contact you for help - as it would not be a "case" under the current Compact.  It would also be interesting to know how many cases involve children of NOAA and USPHS as it may be a comparable.
<b>Wyoming</b>	None

**Question #4: Has your state enacted legislation separate and outside of the Interstate Compact statute to extend the Compact provisions to students that are not currently covered under the Compact? (i.e. National Guard, Reserves, and or civilian employees of the United States Department of Defense, etc.) If yes, please provide the statute(s) title, number, and a brief summary.**

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	3	8.5%
No	30	85.7%
I do not know	2	5.7%
No Responses	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

State	Responses/Comments
<b>Alaska</b>	
<b>Arizona</b>	
<b>Arkansas</b>	The reference is A.C.A. Â§ 6-18-107. The precise verbiage is: "The purpose of this section is to extend laws related to children of active duty members of the uniformed forces under the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children, Â§ 6-4-301 et seq., to children of all components of the uniformed services."

	Please note that this change was made in a completely separate section of the Arkansas Code, so as not to change the Compact statutes.
<b>Colorado</b>	
<b>Delaware</b>	
<b>Florida</b>	
<b>Georgia</b>	
<b>Hawaii</b>	
<b>Idaho</b>	
<b>Kansas</b>	
<b>Kentucky</b>	In 2009 Kentucky extended MIC3 eligibility coverage to dependents of civilian military employees. BRAC 2005 brought Army Human Resources Command to Fort Knox, with thousands of DOD civilian employees transferring into the Elizabethtown/Radcliff/Louisville/Fort Knox area about the same time as Kentucky was entering into the MIC3 compact. That was the driving consideration for Kentucky to adopt DOD civilian families into its compact coverage.
<b>Louisiana</b>	
<b>Maine</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	
<b>Massachusetts</b>	
<b>Missouri</b>	
<b>Montana</b>	If an issue would come up, or legislation is proposed, I will get involved NOW. The compact is sacred in my book and does not need separate legislation to take care of student needs.
<b>Nebraska</b>	
<b>Nevada</b>	
<b>New Hampshire</b>	
<b>New Mexico</b>	
<b>New York</b>	
<b>North Dakota</b>	MIC3 advised against this so why would I break the rules of MIC3
<b>Ohio</b>	
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	
<b>Utah</b>	Utah adopted legislation within the compact itself striking the Title 10 requirement for active duty servicemembers.  <a href="https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title53E/Chapter3/53E-3-S904.html?v=C53E-3-S904_2018012420180124">https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title53E/Chapter3/53E-3-S904.html?v=C53E-3-S904_2018012420180124</a>
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	
<b>Wyoming</b>	

**Question #5:** Has your state proposed legislation that would extend the Compact provisions to students that are currently not covered under the Compact? (i.e. National Guard, Reserves, and or civilian employees of the Department of Defense, etc.) If yes, please provide the year the legislation was proposed, bill number, and a brief summary.

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	1	2.8%
No	30	85.7%
I do not know	4	11.4%
No Responses	0	0.0%

Total 34 100%

State	Responses/Comments
Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	See question 4. I anticipate that more changes may occur during the 2021 legislative session.
Colorado	
Delaware	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Kansas	
Kentucky	Nothing beyond the above.
Louisiana	
Maine	
Maryland	
Massachusetts	
Missouri	
Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	We could not find any past proposed legislation related to this in our Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System.
New Hampshire	
New Mexico	I was appointed last October and have not had any communication with the state regarding the Compact provisions.
New York	
North Dakota	Again, We have been waiting for years for MIC3 do research
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	We have not but I also do not know of any opposition to such a proposal.
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
Tennessee	
Utah	Beyond what was already adopted, no additional legislation is pending.
Virginia	Although suggestions have been made to the Virginia Department of Education to consider requesting legislation that would extend Compact provisions ( outside of the Compact) to federally employed civilians under Title 22 orders.
Washington	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	

**Question #6: As a Commissioner, do you communicate or interact with your local National Guard and/or Reserve command/units? If yes, please provide a brief summary.**

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	22	62.8%
No	11	31.4%
Other	2	5.7%
No Responses	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

State	Responses/Comments
Alaska	

<b>Arizona</b>	
<b>Arkansas</b>	
<b>Colorado</b>	
<b>Delaware</b>	they attend the State Council meeting and I am on their list of all offerings
<b>Florida</b>	
<b>Georgia</b>	
<b>Hawaii</b>	
<b>Idaho</b>	
<b>Kansas</b>	
<b>Kentucky</b>	
<b>Louisiana</b>	
<b>Maine</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	
<b>Massachusetts</b>	
<b>Missouri</b>	
<b>Montana</b>	I personally call headquarters and talk through the the issue. works fine.
<b>Nebraska</b>	
<b>Nevada</b>	
<b>New Hampshire</b>	
<b>New Mexico</b>	
<b>New York</b>	
<b>North Dakota</b>	
<b>Ohio</b>	As Ohio's commissioner I coordinate state-wide operations of Military family supports on a monthly timeframe directly with senior staff of the Ohio National Guard.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	We have included a rep of this community on our state council. We also have employees who are national guard.
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	At times. Most conversations occur around SC Military Cord Honor Ceremony for high school seniors; and Purple Star.
<b>Tennessee</b>	
<b>Utah</b>	
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	Occasionally over the years
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Various commanders and with the Youth/Child program
<b>Wyoming</b>	We do communicate with the Wyoming National Guard Deputy Public Affairs Office in order stay up to date on the deployments that are occurring in our state. This information is reported to the State Council.

**Question #7: Does your MIC3 State Council include a representative(s) from the National Guard and/or Reserves? If yes, please provide a brief summary.**

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	19	54.2%
No	12	34.2%
I do not know	1	2.8%
Other	3	8.5%
No Responses	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

State	Responses/Comments
<b>Alaska</b>	
<b>Arizona</b>	
<b>Arkansas</b>	Yes. See question 6.
<b>Colorado</b>	

<b>Delaware</b>	We usually have one or two attending. Additionally, National Guard reps attend our Purple Up day.
<b>Florida</b>	
<b>Georgia</b>	
<b>Hawaii</b>	This was a topic of discussion at a recent state council meeting, and we have begun discussions with the Army and Air National Guard on whether they would prefer a single representative or one from each branch.
<b>Idaho</b>	
<b>Kansas</b>	
<b>Kentucky</b>	Kentucky National Guard has an education officer invited to participate.
<b>Louisiana</b>	The Louisiana National has a program manager named to the Council, though the person wasn't present at the last meeting.
<b>Maine</b>	We have the State Adjutant General, the Deputy Adjutant General, and the leader of the family engagement office for the national guard.
<b>Maryland</b>	
<b>Massachusetts</b>	State Military & Family Program Director for the Massachusetts National Guard is ex-officio member of the council.
<b>Missouri</b>	
<b>Montana</b>	Guard rep attends our meetings. Usually 2-4 per year. And family support person from active air force adds to any discussion.
<b>Nebraska</b>	
<b>Nevada</b>	One of our members is a representative of the Nevada Army National Guard.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	Yes, they are invited and attend. They update the Council on current data and their support of families of
<b>New Mexico</b>	We don't currently have an appointed yet - I'm working on getting that resolved. We are proposing to have a National Guard representative on our Council.
<b>New York</b>	One member belongs to the National Guard leadership.
<b>North Dakota</b>	
<b>Ohio</b>	When I became commissioner, the state council chair in the Fall of 2012- I directed for 2 seats to be added to the Rutan Council for the Ohio National Guard.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	Yes. We have one rep.
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	The current Tennessee Guard Family Program Director is expected to join our state council in the fall of 2020.
<b>Utah</b>	
<b>Virginia</b>	The Virginia Secretary of Defense and Veterans affairs is a member of the Virginia National Guard and serves on the Council at the pleasure of the Governor.
<b>Washington</b>	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Chair of the Youth and Family program, spouse of Guard Member, Guard member.
<b>Wyoming</b>	Not at this point but have talked as a council about asking the guard for a representative.

**Question #8: Does your state inform National Guard and/or Reserve service members and families about the Interstate Compact and the accommodations available to them if they move under a Title 10 status? If yes, please provide a brief summary.**

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	14	40.0%
No	7	20.0%
I do not know	11	31.4%
Other	3	8.5%
No Responses	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

State	Responses/Comments
<b>Alaska</b>	
<b>Arizona</b>	

<b>Arkansas</b>	
<b>Colorado</b>	
<b>Delaware</b>	
<b>Florida</b>	
<b>Georgia</b>	
<b>Hawaii</b>	
<b>Idaho</b>	
<b>Kansas</b>	At least not directly, that I am aware of.
<b>Kentucky</b>	
<b>Louisiana</b>	
<b>Maine</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	when possible
<b>Massachusetts</b>	
<b>Missouri</b>	Annually or when requested
<b>Montana</b>	As needed, I would inform appropriate party(s). We just don't have many needs.
<b>Nebraska</b>	
<b>Nevada</b>	
<b>New Hampshire</b>	
<b>New Mexico</b>	
<b>New York</b>	
<b>North Dakota</b>	
<b>Ohio</b>	Several of the Ohio MIC3's most active members on the State Council are senior leaders of the Ohio National Guard (ONG), Reserve Components. Ohio MIC3 is part of an annual checklist with the education and youth staff of ONG for Training.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	
<b>Utah</b>	
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	See comments
<b>Wyoming</b>	In the past our state council has sent out MIC3 information to district superintendents so they can distribute throughout their schools. As a council, we have talked about either having a booth or doing a presentation at the state's superintendent's annual meeting.

**Question #9: Has your State Department of Education implemented the Military Student Identifier (MSI) mandated under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)?**

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	30	85.70%
No	2	5.70%
I do not know	3	8.50%
Other	0	0.0%
No Responses	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

State	Responses/Comments
<b>Alaska</b>	
<b>Arizona</b>	
<b>Arkansas</b>	
<b>Colorado</b>	



<b>Delaware</b>	
<b>Florida</b>	
<b>Georgia</b>	Georgia chose an alternate method that identifies children with a military parent.
<b>Hawaii</b>	Yes, we are able to identify military students for ESSA reporting via the data collected by the Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE). But there is no single Military Student Identifier.
<b>Idaho</b>	
<b>Kansas</b>	
<b>Kentucky</b>	
<b>Louisiana</b>	
<b>Maine</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	
<b>Massachusetts</b>	
<b>Missouri</b>	
<b>Montana</b>	
<b>Nebraska</b>	
<b>Nevada</b>	We identify military students in our student information system.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	
<b>New Mexico</b>	
<b>New York</b>	
<b>North Dakota</b>	
<b>Ohio</b>	Our state plan for ESSA which encompasses the inclusion of National Guard, Reserve Components was approved by the U.S. DOE. I authored this section of the document, state plan on behalf of the Ohio Department of Education.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	The categories are: Active Duty Military Dependent, National Guard Military Dependent, Reserve Military Dependent  System Description/Purpose: In accordance with T.C.A. Â§ 49-1-209, the Education Information System (EIS) was developed as a manageable, centralized repository of information to provide accurate student and staff data necessary for the management of schools and the allocation of state funds for educational purpose.
<b>Utah</b>	
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Important to remember that this is a voluntary identifier and some/many military members are reluctant to ID their children for a variety of reasons. It is up to the family to provide the information.  What is the purpose of this question if the data gathered is potentially inaccurate and does not represent the real situation?  <a href="https://understandingessa.org/expanding-msi-helps-provide-equal-sup">https://understandingessa.org/expanding-msi-helps-provide-equal-sup</a>  <a href="https://eangus.org/wp-content/uploads">https://eangus.org/wp-content/uploads</a>  <a href="https://www.mic3.net/assets/info-paper_essa_2016.12.pdf">https://www.mic3.net/assets/info-paper_essa_2016.12.pdf</a>
<b>Wyoming</b>	

**Question #10: Under the Military Student Identifier, what kind of data is collected by your state on active duty service members? Check all that apply:**

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Active Duty (Air Force, Army, Navy, Marines)	23	67.6%

Active Duty Coast Guard	17	50.0%
National Oceanic Atmosphere Administration (NOAA)	5	14.7%
US Public Health Services (USPHS)	4	11.7%
Army National Guard	17	50.0%
Air National Guard	15	44.1%
I do not know	8	23.5%
Other	4	11.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>State</b>	<b>Responses/Comments</b>
<b>Alaska</b>	
<b>Arizona</b>	We only collect if a student's parent is in the military. The branch information is not included in the collection. Answered "Other" – Only collect if they are in the military.
<b>Arkansas</b>	
<b>Colorado</b>	
<b>Delaware</b>	
<b>Florida</b>	Guard are only counted if on active duty Title 10.
<b>Georgia</b>	My assumption is the student identifier used in Georgia includes children of all active duty parents including National Guard but I am not certain.
<b>Hawaii</b>	The data requested under ESSA are collected based on Federal Impact Aid data collection cards, but not by one single flag as a military identifier. Other caveats are (1) Navy and Marines are combined under the Navy, and (2) Army and Air National Guard data are only for those who fall under Title 10 active duty.
<b>Idaho</b>	
<b>Kansas</b>	
<b>Kentucky</b>	
<b>Louisiana</b>	
<b>Maine</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Acceptable Values/Code Description:  00 - Not a member of a military member  01 - Yes, child of active duty member  02 - Yes, child of member or veteran who was medically discharged or retired in the last year.  03 - Yes, child of member who died on active duty last year  Answered "Other" – Service not collected
<b>Missouri</b>	
<b>Montana</b>	
<b>Nebraska</b>	An indication that the student has a parent or guardian that is a member of the Armed Services on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty. The terms "Armed Services", "active duty" and "full-time National Guard duty" have the same meanings as defined in 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(4), 101(d)(1), and 101(d)(5)
<b>Nevada</b>	
<b>New Hampshire</b>	
<b>New Mexico</b>	
<b>New York</b>	Answered "Other" - Military are asked to self-report; this includes all categories.
<b>North Dakota</b>	
<b>Ohio</b>	Answered "Other" - Reserves
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	We are looking to implement this school year.

<b>Tennessee</b>	
<b>Utah</b>	I'll email data collection information separately.
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	Checked the CG above - parents and administrators may consider the Coast Guard as part of the "armed forces), see the below  A = active duty in U.S. Armed Forces  R = reserves in U.S. Armed Forces  N = no parent or guardian is currently serving  M = Student/family reported having more than one parent or guardian who are U.S. Armed
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Again, this is a voluntary identifier and we ask that all military members, active/guard/reserve provide the info. We have not specifically added NOAA or USPHS to the request info. <a href="https://dpi.wi.gov/wise/data-elements/parent-in-military">https://dpi.wi.gov/wise/data-elements/parent-in-military</a>  What is the purpose of this question if the data gathered is potentially inaccurate and does not represent the real situation? <a href="https://understandingessa.org/expanding-msi-helps-provide-equal-support-for-all-military-connected-students/">https://understandingessa.org/expanding-msi-helps-provide-equal-support-for-all-military-connected-students/</a> <a href="https://eangus.org/">https://eangus.org/</a>
<b>Wyoming</b>	

**Question #11: Under the Military Student Identifier, is data collected in your state on National Guard or Reserve members?**

	Number of Response(s)	Response Ratio
Yes	19	54.2%
No	9	25.7%
I do not know	7	20.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>

State	Responses/Comments
<b>Alaska</b>	
<b>Arizona</b>	
<b>Arkansas</b>	
<b>Colorado</b>	
<b>Delaware</b>	see above
<b>Florida</b>	Unless they are on active duty.
<b>Georgia</b>	Again, yes, that is an assumption only however.
<b>Hawaii</b>	Yes, collected on the Federal Impact Aid form for those who are deployed on Title 10 active duty. But again, not collected by one single flag as a Military Identifier.
<b>Idaho</b>	
<b>Kansas</b>	
<b>Kentucky</b>	
<b>Louisiana</b>	
<b>Maine</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Only if the member was on active duty - see previous question response.
<b>Missouri</b>	
<b>Montana</b>	
<b>Nebraska</b>	An indication that the student has a parent or guardian that is a member of the Armed Services on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty. The terms "Armed Services", "active duty" and "full-time National Guard duty" have the same meanings as defined in 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(4), 101(d)(1), and 101(d)(5)

<b>Nevada</b>	
<b>New Hampshire</b>	
<b>New Mexico</b>	
<b>New York</b>	If the family is willing to report they are included with the data.
<b>North Dakota</b>	
<b>Ohio</b>	EMIS collects, supports the data across Ohio's School Districts.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
<b>Oregon</b>	
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	
<b>Utah</b>	If covered by the compact.
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	<a href="https://dpi.wi.gov/wise/data-elements/parent-in-military">https://dpi.wi.gov/wise/data-elements/parent-in-military</a>
<b>Wyoming</b>	

**Question #12: Is there any additional information the Task Force should be aware of regarding National Guard and Reserve families or dependents in your state?**

<b>State</b>	<b>Responses/Comments</b>
<b>Alaska</b>	No.
<b>Arizona</b>	Not that I am aware of.
<b>Arkansas</b>	Arkansas has been moving the past few years to extend the protections of the Compact to reserve component families, and I anticipate we will move in the future to include civilian employees of the military services. Data on how many Arkansas Guardsmen or reservists are affected by transfers for military service are lacking, but anecdotally, they do occur from time to time.
<b>Colorado</b>	No
<b>Delaware</b>	I do not know how difficult or easy a Delaware law change would be.
<b>Florida</b>	Florida has about 12,000 Guard members. They have been quite often activated for duty all over the world. Their units are scattered across the state.
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Hawaii</b>	The MIC3 state commissioner for Hawaii is a retired officer of the Hawaii Air National Guard.
<b>Idaho</b>	no
<b>Kansas</b>	No additional information.
<b>Kentucky</b>	All for inclusion. While they are not technically included, we "act" like they are and the Kentucky Department of Education makes no distinction. We have had no related issues. Easy transition to make here in Kentucky.
<b>Louisiana</b>	None
<b>Maine</b>	No other comments.
<b>Maryland</b>	No
<b>Massachusetts</b>	None
<b>Missouri</b>	NA
<b>Montana</b>	If every stated and the task force would follow the compact, issues should not get in the way.
<b>Nebraska</b>	Nebraska law, whether statute or regulation, require school districts to promptly enroll and provide education services to all students who reside in a school district regardless of the mobility of the parent or family.
<b>Nevada</b>	None.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	NH has a large contingent of Guard and Reserves. The State Council supports their inclusion in the Compact. This is and continues to be a goal of the Council.
<b>New Mexico</b>	Not at this time.
<b>New York</b>	NY - these families need more information as typically they see the Compact as a support in areas where it cannot be applied.
<b>North Dakota</b>	We are in historic times. We have completely ignored that the front line workers of this Pandemic are the National Guard and Reserves. Although the Guard is not using Title 10, they have been deployed on homeland soil. MIC3 is being narrow minded about researching the Reserves and their Title 10 status and impacts on MIC3 and military

	students. Gosh knows MIC3 makes up actions when it is AGAINST people, but we can't take a look at a potential "EXCEPTION TO POLICY" during this COVID-19 pandemic. PERIOD....
<b>Ohio</b>	And I am sure you will agree, to faithfully, fully, and formally implement any changes to existing MIC3 laws -- we will need a greatly expanded team and coalition to accomplish this for the 50+1...and our Military families, local educators. It cannot alone be done by 2 full time staffers, and 50+1 volunteers. Please let Ohio know how we can be of any support in the months and years ahead.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	No
<b>Oregon</b>	If national guard and reserve families were added to the compact it take Oregon up to two years to amend the compact due to our legislative schedule.
<b>Rhode Island</b>	No
<b>South Carolina</b>	na
<b>Tennessee</b>	COVID-19 has caused the deployments of guard and reserve members within the United States, this is in addition to deployments overseas that have been extended due to COVID-19.
<b>Utah</b>	They deserve to be covered by the compact. :-)  Thanks for everyone's work on this issue.
<b>Virginia</b>	No.
<b>Washington</b>	The likely best source of Reserve/Guard information about the use of the identifier and federalized or not will come from the parents of Guard/Reserve service members. Guessing that school administrators may not know the difference unless a parent raises the issue. Also not assuming that federalized Guard/reserve parents would necessarily take advantage of switching their Reserve/Guard status as part of their enrollment data change if/when they are federalized.
<b>Wisconsin</b>	It is challenging for families & Commissioners to operate under a divided system. We support students of SOME military members. It is difficult to explain why some students receive support and others do not, particularly when the members of the Guard and Reserve are often more frequently activated and deployed than AD counterparts. Add to that the support for children of NOAA and USPHS and NOT Guard/Reserve, further complicating the system. Families have enough to deal with when moving into Title 32 or Title 10 status to add on that knowing which children do or do not get the support and protections under the Compact. Few have the time or energy to figure it out. This typically impacts the lower ranking, most needy members. There should be one Compact and "system" that supports and protects all children of all military members. It should not depend on active duty status. I'm unsure of the original thinking behind the Compact, but it seems like an antiquated approach.
<b>Wyoming</b>	Not at this time.

**NGRTF Survey**

	<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>No Response</b>	<b>Vacant</b>
<b>Alabama</b>	Douglas Ragland		1	
<b>Alaska</b>	Terry Ryals	1		
<b>Arizona</b>	Bruce DuPlanty	1		
<b>Arkansas</b>	Don Kaminar	1		
<b>California</b>	VACANT			1
<b>Colorado</b>	Keith Owen	1		
<b>Connecticut</b>	Laura Anastasio		1	
<b>Delaware</b>	Susan Haberstroh	1		
<b>District of Columbia</b>	VACANT			1
<b>Florida</b>	Robert Buehn	1		
<b>Georgia</b>	Will Hardin	1		
<b>Hawaii</b>	Kathy Berg	1		
<b>Idaho</b>	Tim McMurtrey	1		
<b>Illinois</b>	Darcy Benway		1	
<b>Indiana</b>	VACANT			1
<b>Iowa</b>	Misty Nissen			1
<b>Kansas</b>	Craig Neuenswander	1		
<b>Kentucky</b>	Steven P. Bullard	1		
<b>Louisiana</b>	Ernise S. Singleton	1		
<b>Maine</b>	Tyler Backus	1		
<b>Maryland</b>	Mary Gable	1		
<b>Massachusetts</b>	RADM J. Clarke Orzalli	1		
<b>Michigan</b>	VACANT			1
<b>Minnesota</b>	Daron Korte		1	
<b>Mississippi</b>	VACANT			1
<b>Missouri</b>	Brian Henry	1		
<b>Montana</b>	Hal Stearns	1		
<b>Nebraska</b>	Brian Halstead	1		
<b>Nevada</b>	Felicia Gonzales	1		
<b>New Hampshire</b>	Kathleen Murphy	1		
<b>New Jersey</b>	Tony Trongone		1	
<b>New Mexico</b>	Teresa Ferenczhalmy	1		
<b>New York</b>	Debra Jackson	1		
<b>North Carolina</b>	VACANT			1
<b>North Dakota</b>	Davina French	1		
<b>Ohio</b>	Pete Lupiba	1		
<b>Oklahoma</b>	Dr. Darrell Floyd	1		
<b>Oregon</b>	Cindy Hunt	1		
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	VACANT			1
<b>Rhode Island</b>	Rosemarie Kraeger	1		
<b>South Carolina</b>	Yolande Anderson	1		
<b>South Dakota</b>	Alan Kerr		1	
<b>Tennessee</b>	Deanna McLaughlin	1		
<b>Texas</b>	Shelly Ramos		1	
<b>Utah</b>	Ben Rasmussen	1		
<b>Vermont</b>	David Young		1	
<b>Virginia</b>	Dan Dunham	1		
<b>Washington</b>	Greg Lynch	1		

<b>West Virginia</b>	Chris Cmiel		1	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Shelley Joan Weiss	1		
<b>Wyoming</b>	Chad Delbridge	1	0	
		<b>34</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>