

HOW CAN THE DOD MINIMIZE THE IMPACT ON THE RESERVIST/NATIONAL
GUARDSMAN'S CIVILIAN EMPLOYER WHILE TRANSFORMING TO AN
OPERATIONAL FORCE?

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE
Strategy

by

TIMOTHY H. WRIGHT, MAJ, US ARMY

BS Empire State College, State University of New York at Fredonia, New York, 1990

AD BELLUM PACE PARATI

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
2008

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved</i> <i>OMB No. 0704-0188</i>		
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE 13-06-2008		2. REPORT TYPE Master's Thesis		3. DATES COVERED AUG 2007 – JUN 2008	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE HOW CAN THE DOD MINIMIZE THE IMPACT ON THE RESERVIST/NATIONAL GUARDSMAN'S CIVILIAN EMPLOYER WHILE TRANSFORMING TO AN OPERATIONAL FORCE?			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJ TIMOTHY H. WRIGHT			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301			8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This study provides the analysis and research necessary to identify and recommend ways to support reservists' civilian employers. Employers are not able to support sustained reservist absences that are now more frequent and for longer periods of time. Reservists must maintain employment and thus they encounter more issues surrounding their dual-status than they have in the past. Educating employers about the nation's reliance on them and reservists is important. Governmental agencies at both state and federal levels must support and inform employers about the restructuring of the reserve forces from a strategic reserve to an operational reserve. This has not been done effectively. Making employers aware of this transformation within the reserve components is essential if an operational reserve is to be successful. Addition by Congress of tangible benefits that aid the employer in temporarily replacing the reservist during deployment will garner employer support. Recruitment and retention initiatives for the operational reserve component force are also essential. At the top of the initiative list is developing a strategy that will support employers. When reservists are absent from work, employers and businesses lose money. Concerns for employers are not addressed by monetary or other cost saving incentives - a language employers and businesses understand. The study recommends such a policy be established which allows personnel replacements, other forms of reimbursement, and employer partnerships that when combined fully support the civilian employers of the operational reserve.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Transformation, Reserve Components, Operational Force, Civilian Employers					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT (U)	b. ABSTRACT (U)	a. REPORT (U)			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code)
			(U)	94	

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE
THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: Major Timothy H. Wright

Thesis Title: HOW CAN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) MINIMIZE THE
IMPACT ON THE RESERVISTS' CIVILIAN EMPLOYERS IN ORDER TO
MAINTAIN AN OPERATIONAL RESERVE COMPONENT FORCE?

Approved by:

_____, Thesis Committee Chair
Ralph O. Doughty, Ph.D.

_____, Member
Brigadier General William D. R. Waff, D.Min.

_____, Member
LTC Prisco R. Hernandez, Ph.D.

Accepted this 13th day of June 2008 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

HOW CAN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) MINIMIZE THE IMPACT ON THE RESERVISTS' CIVILIAN EMPLOYERS IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN AN OPERATIONAL RESERVE COMPONENT FORCE? by Major Timothy Wright, 94 pages.

This study provides the analysis and research necessary to identify and recommend ways to support reservists' civilian employers. Employers are not able to support sustained reservist absences that are now more frequent and for longer periods of time. The need to support employers has increased with the new U.S. National Security Strategy. Adequate support from Congress to employers is necessary. Reservists must maintain employment and thus they encounter more issues surrounding their dual-status than they have in the past.

Increased communication between DoL, DoD (ESGR) and employers on supporting the employment of reservists will assist in educating employers about the nation's reliance on them and reservists in maintaining national security. Governmental agencies at both state and federal levels must support and inform employers about the restructuring of the reserve forces from a strategic reserve to an operational reserve. This has not been done effectively. Making employers aware of this transformation within the reserve components is essential if an operational reserve is to be successful.

Addition by Congress of tangible benefits that aid the employer in temporarily replacing the reservist during deployment will garner employer support. Recruitment and retention initiatives for the operational reserve component force are also essential. At the top of the initiative list is developing a strategy that will support employers. When reservists are absent from work, employers and businesses lose money.

Today, concerns for employers are not addressed by monetary or other cost saving incentives which is a language employers and businesses understand. The study recommends such a policy be established which allows personnel replacements, other forms of reimbursement, and employer partnerships that when combined fully support the civilian employers of the operational reserve.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people helped to bring this work together in a coherent fashion and I owe them all a debt of gratitude. To my wonderful wife Christine, whose inspiration, moral support and encouragement kept me focused while, in my absence, she served as mom and dad maintaining the family. After two long combat deployments my family fully supported and encouraged my attending this esteemed educational military institution, a once in a lifetime opportunity for a Troop Program Unit (TPU) Reservist, realizing it would resemble another long deployment. To Dr. Doughty, my committee chair, whose keen insights, wisdom and attention to detail kept me on the path to success. To COL Raymond, my research methods proctor, and mentor, whose support, level of caring, and student outreach will never be forgotten. To Brigadier General Waff, special thanks for understanding the importance of this thesis and providing cutting-edge research and employer support insights that will drive the future of support to civilian employers. To LTC Hernandez, for your support, truly unique outlook and objective focus. To all of the Reservists and National Guardsmen serving our nation at war, your sacrifice, selfless service and dedication continue to inspire me. I hope that this thesis reaches and educates civilian leaders on the complexities encountered by reservists, their families, and their civilian employers with the transformation to a Reserve Operational Force. Last, I wish to thank all of the civilian employers who go above and beyond to support reservists, their families, and the Nation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE THESIS APPROVAL PAGE	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ACRONYMS	viii
TABLES	xii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH DESIGN (METHODOLOGY)	18
CHAPTER FOUR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	20
Civilian Employers and Employment	21
The Reservist	22
Legal Issues	24
Government	27
Civilian Employer Mitigation	31
Military Recruitment and Retention	35
Civilian Factors	40
Civilian Employer Support Options	48
Continued Legislation for Employer Support	49
Increased Financial Assistance	50
Improved Reserve Commander Flexibility	50
Employer Education Support Payment Options	52
Temporary Personnel Replacement	53
Select Reserve Option	58
Teen-Citizen Support Plan	61
Employment Partnership Program	62
Summary of Analysis Results	68
CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	70
CONCLUSIONS	70

RECOMMENDATIONS.....	74
REFERENCE LIST	77
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	82

ACRONYMS

AC	Active Component
ACP	Army Campaign Plan
ACS (RA)	Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Affairs
ADCS	Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff
AGR	Active Guard and Reserve
AKO	Army Knowledge on Line
ANG	Army National Guard
AR	Army Reserve
ARCOM	Army Reserve Command
AREF	Army Reserve Expeditionary Force
ARFORGEN	Army Force Generation Model
ARFPC	Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee
ARNG	Army National Guard
ARSTAFF	Army Staff
ASA/MRA	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs
ASD	Assistant Secretary of Defense
ASD (RA)	Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs
ASN/MRA	Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs
Bde	Brigade
Bn	Battalion
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure Act
C, NGB	Chief, National Guard Bureau

CA	Civil Affairs
CAR	Chief Army Reserve
CATA	Civil Affairs Team Alpha
CG	Commanding General
CIV	Federal Civilian Employee
CJCS	Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff
CMD or Cmd	Command
CMOC	Civil Military Operation Center
CNGR	Commission on the National Guard and Reserve s
COE	Contemporary Operating Environment
CS	Combat Support
CSA	Chief of Staff Army
CSS	Combat Service Support
D, ARNG	Director Army National Guard
DDAA	National Defense Authorization Act
DGDP	Directorate of Graduate Degree Programs
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DIMA	Drilling Individual mobilization Augmentee
DIV or Div	Division
DOD or DoD	Department of Defense
DoDD	Department of Defense Directive
DOL	Department of Labor
ESGR	Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FORSCOM	Forces Command

FRRI	Federal Reserve Restructuring Initiative
FTS	Full-Time Support
FY	Fiscal Year
GDP	Graduate Degree Programs
GWOT	Global War on Terrorism
GP	Group
HLD	Homeland Defense
HLS	Homeland Security
HQ	Headquarters
HRC	Human Resources Command
IMA	Individual Mobilization Augmentee
ING	Inactive Guard
IRR	Individual Ready Reserve
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JS	Joint Staff
MOS	Military Occupational Specialty
NCESGR	National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve
NG	National Guard
NGB	National Guard Bureau
NSA	National Security Act
OCSA	Chief of Staff, Army Office of Reserve Affairs
OEF	Operation Enduring Freedom
OIF	Operation Iraqi Freedom
OMB	Office of Management and Budget

ONE	Operation Noble Eagle
OPTEMPO	Operating/Operations Tempo
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense
PCA	Posse Comitatus Act
PRC	Presidential Reserve Call Up
QDR	Quadrennial Defense Review
RC	Reserve Component
RCCC	Reserve Component coordination Council
RFPB	Reserve Forces Policy Board
RGT	Regiment
SAD	State Active Duty
SDF	State Defense Forces
SECARMY	Secretary of the Army
SECDEF	or SecDef – Secretary of Defense
SFG	Special Forces Group
TAA	Total Army Analysis
TPU	Troop Program Unit
USAR	United States Army Reserve
USARC	United States Army Reserve Command
USC	United states Code
USERRA	Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act
UTA	Unit Training Assembly
VETS	Veterans' Employment and Training Service
VOLAR	Volunteer Army
VRRA	Veterans' Reemployment Rights Act

TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Current Mobilization Authorities for Reserve Forces	34

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides historical information about the reserve components of the United States military (referred to hereafter as “Reserves”), and outlines areas of concern for civilian employers who bear the brunt of supporting today’s new operational reserve component force. An operational reserve is one that is required for repetitive tours of duty of lengthy duration during each deployment. The primary research question for this thesis is, “How can the Department of Defense (DoD) minimize the impact on the reservists’ civilian employers in order to maintain an operational reserve component force?” Considered a part-time military force, the reserve has transformed from a strategic force for national emergencies to one that is relied on repeatedly for overseas deployments for extended periods of up to a year every five years under the current model for the Afghanistan and Iraq campaigns.

For an operational force to be viable over the long-term, support for civilian employers is critical. Support structures are needed as a part of the U.S. National Security Strategy. Employers sacrifice and suffer losses when their workforce reservists are absent for military duty (Houseman, 1999). Reservists also suffer during mobilizations, since civilian employment is their main source of income. Realizing that the reservist will continue to require a civilian career underscores the need to support the employer who is faced with loss of his employees during reoccurring deployments.

How to adequately mitigate an employer loss is a difficult problem and is at the heart of this thesis. Many factors such as position in the business, number of employees, productivity and other issues come into play when an employee is absent from work.

These absences create a greater burden for employers given the increase in the number and duration of deployments. To fully understand the importance of supporting employers it is also necessary to consider several secondary research questions. These questions include: What factors affect a person's decision to join and remain in the reserves? What is the best way to support employers? What are the potential civilian and military implications of not fully supporting employers?

To maintain an operational force may require that Congress pass legislation to support employers. The change from a strategic reserve to an operational reserve is new to the employer. The newness of this operational force concept as such requires that civilian employers understand and support the operational force. Methods to support employers and encourage their partnership with and support of the reserves are proposed in this study.

Since the creation of the Army Reserve in 1908, and the National Guard/militia long before then - reserve component forces members, National Guard and Federal Reserve - have maintained civilian employment when not engaged in service to the nation. Whether the year be 1908 or 2008, the employer is critical to the reservist and, therefore, to national defense. Since the military currently relies on an all-volunteer force, and since U.S. taxpayers are unwilling to fund a substantially larger active force, the importance of the reservists and, by extension, of civilian employers becomes critical.

Politics and party influence continued to impact the allocation of units to the Army National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve. In 1990, the fate of these two Reserve Component forces was in jeopardy. A force structure change calling for the re-allocation of combat forces from the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) to the Army National Guard

(ARNG) and movement of brigade sized and larger combat support (CS) and combat service support (CSS) units from the ARNG into the USAR realigned the reserve for several decades.

The Total Army Concept and the Total Force Policy remained in effect during OPERATION DESERT SHIELD and OPERATION DESERT STORM. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush authorized the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army to order to active duty no more than 25,000 combat service support (CSS) selected reservists. In a matter of six months, the ceiling was raised to 220,000 reserve component personnel that could be called to active duty under Section 673 of Title 10 United States Code (USC). Although mobilization durations for reserve component forces remained somewhat rigid, the viability of the all-volunteer force was no longer an issue.

The end to the Cold War threat led to a reduction in the size of the Active Duty (AD) force. A smaller strategic reserve was retained to provide augmentation of the smaller active duty force, thereby reducing the cost of the total force compared to retaining an equivalent sized AD force.

Chapter Two of this study provides a review of literature available and identifies historical and current literature and documentation related to reservists and employers. The literature will reinforce the lasting consternation surrounding the move from a strategic reserve to an operational force and its impact on employers. Congressional vision, willingness to change, support, and adaptability are critical to the viability of the Reserve Components as an operational force. Employer support remains at the heart of the use of all military reserve forces and should not be overlooked.

Americans have a responsibility for ensuring the maintenance of a fully supported operational reserve component force for the future. Solutions that address the issues and concerns of employers and of reservists in the new operational reserve are critical. Reservists may soon be compelled to choose between service in the reserves or maintaining long- term civilian employment. Achieving both without providing additional support to employers will be difficult. Since the nation now lacks a Strategic Reserve and faces a variety of potential threats there will continue to be a requirement for an all-volunteer operational reserve component force (GAO-06-745, 2006). Immediate attention to the employers' role is critical to the viability of reserve forces. A potential solution is to provide incentives to employers who support the reserves.

Any proposed solution must begin with the recognition that employers have an unrecognized responsibility for national security. A number of related issues require resolution and will be analyzed in Chapter Four. The main issue is the need to maintain reservist employment and how to support the loss of employer's employees when mobilized.

There is a broad effort to update force structure in both the DoD and in the ARNG's individual states and USAR's command structure to keep up with the changes being experienced by reserves. For example, the ARFORGEN Army force management program has been tailored to the USAR and ARNG (McCarthy, 2004). The ability of employers to withstand the loss of reservists to mobilization remains the foundation of maintaining an effective and sustainable force. In the twenty-first century reserve, mere recruitment is not enough to maintain the reserves. Governmental agencies at both state and federal levels must support and inform employers about the restructuring of the

reserve forces from a strategic reserve to an operational role. This has not been done effectively. Complaints from reservists are on the rise, with a lack of employer education and understanding about the operational reserve also being a contributing factor (Associated Press, 2007). Making employers aware of this transformation within the reserve components is an essential first step if an operational reserve is to be successful.

Today, national defense calls for a four-pronged approach. It calls for the U.S. to 1) shape the international environment, 2) prepare military forces for the future, and 3) respond to crises when and where required. By embracing an operational force strategy for the next century, the reserve components are moving to the forefront of efforts to secure peace, stimulate democracy, and foster market economies on a global scale. Reservists are an integral and vital part of the Total Force, and the nation will rely more heavily on reserve forces well into the future. Recognizing that civilian employers are directly involved and affected by reservists' service, this study provides the analysis and research necessary to identify and recommend ways to support employers.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The transformation of the Reserve Components into an operational force is a subject which will greatly impact employers. Developing a usable program that supports the employer is crucial to maintaining an operational reserve for the long-term. The radical change in the reserve mission to that of an operational force has expanded problems for the employer (Army, October 15, 2007). These problems, if not properly addressed, will continue to impact reservists and their employers. A reservists' decision whether to join the reserves may impact future operational force manpower sustainment. Existing legislation continues to be modified to better accommodate employers and the literature on the subject reflects this. Analysis of many articles from the *Army Times Magazine* shows that the need to adequately address employer support is current and relevant. Without publication of articles that expose a greater need for employer support, reservists have few ways of explaining employer issues that are related to their military service.

The following documentation forms the basis for this thesis. The Commission on the National Guard and Reserve, established by the Ronald Reagan Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. Congress tasked the commission to provide three reports relative to the roles and missions of the reserve components. The first of the three reports was submitted to Congress on June 5, 2006 and outlined the Commission's organization and progress of work. The second report was submitted on March 1, 2007 titled, Strengthening Americas Defenses in the New Security Environment. This report addresses the ARNG Empowerment Act and the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2008. The second report also outlines many relevant concerns facing the employer. Many areas of concern that relate to the operational force, reservist and employer are acknowledged for further study and investigation (CNGR, March, 2007). The final report submitted to Congress on January 31, 2008 titled Transforming the ARNG and USAR into a 21st Century Operational Force contains the Commission's findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Final Report serves as a launch pad from which Congress can take decisive action that supports employers. Recommendations are made by the Commission that will best support retention of an operational reserve component force.

Employer support is identified as a critical component in retaining the reserves (CNGR, January, 2008). Articles in journals and professional publications provide the additional information to study issues that pertain to the employer. Research conducted in this study used other primary sources of information including Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reports and podcasts. The CBO identifies relative past Congressional testimony and documentation that establishes a need to support the employer in order to retain reservists (Congressional, 2007). The ability of reservists to contribute to national defense depends in part on the support of their civilian employers (Military, 2004). The current trend toward longer and more frequent reserve deployments, however, raises questions about the ability of civilian employers, particularly small businesses, to absorb the costs they experience when their reservist employees are mobilized (CBO, 2005).

The VETERANS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2004, 108TH CONGRESS report to SENATE, September 20, 2004, continues the focus on reservists' benefits and does not mention the employer. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs

(hereinafter, 'Committee'), to which was referred the bill S. 2486, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and enhance education, housing, employment, medical, and other benefits for veterans and to improve and extend certain authorities relating to the administration or benefits for veterans, and for other purposes (Veterans', 2004). Continued government focus on benefits provided to the reservist avoids addressing the key to operational reserve sustainment, their employer. Providing benefits to reservists is little good if the reservist cannot obtain or maintain their desired civilian employment. If employers are not supported, reservists may not be hired to fill civilian vacancies (CBO, May, 2005, p.27). Therefore, reservists will not join the reserves and will in turn focus on civilian employment.

The Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) of 1994 and the U.S. Department of Labor – Veterans' Employment and Training Service (VETS) exist to protect the employer and reservist against unfair labor practices. Consistency between USERRA and VETS aids employer and employee cooperation. Examples of the collaboration between DoD and DoL include: establishing one stop career centers near major military installations (Norfolk, Va.; San Diego, Calif.; Fort Campbell, Ky.), expanding opportunities for reservists and military spouses to access training and education grants, exploring options with states to offer unemployment compensation to military spouses, working across states to improve reciprocity for state certifications and licensing requirements to reduce employment lags, and targeting unemployment by establishing a military spouse unemployment index (DOL, July 2003). Although providing benefits is good, focusing benefits where they will do the most good

is even better. Reservists deserve benefits, and employers who support the reservists do even more so when it comes to sustaining the operational reserve component force.

Additional primary sources used in this study are; The General Accounting Office, Hon. Thomas F. Hall, Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, (2007). The Officer Magazine, Reserve Officers Association. Jack C. Stultz Jr. LTG, Chief, Army Reserve. Veterans Day Message (2007). Reserve Forces for National Security (Gray) Report to the Secretary of Defense by the Committee on Civilian Components Library, Army War College (June 7, 1960).

Secondary sources used in this study are published books such as *Twice the Citizen: the New Challenges of Serving in the Army Reserve and National Guard* and the monograph *Twenty-First Century Force: a Federal Army and a Militia*. Source journals reviewed include: *The Reserve Policies of Nations: a Comparative Analysis*, *The National Interest*, *The Washington Quarterly*, *NATO Review*, *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, *Defense Concepts*, and *The Journal of Strategic Studies*. The archives of other publications were also used, including the *New York Times*, *The Army Times* and professional magazines including the *Reserve Officer Association Magazine*, the *Army Magazine*, *Soldiers Magazine*, and numerous online websites.

Several issues such as recruitment and retention difficulties, increased complaints about employers, and uninformed and under supported employers mold the future impact of the operational force structure's impact on employers and reservists. Viable options that support the employer while in turn insuring a strong future operational reserve are considered in this study. The changing reserve force structure and operation tempo

(OPTEMPO) requires Congressional consensus and adequate legislation to achieve employers' full support of the reserves.

In the book *Twice the Citizen* Sean Herron identifies the complexities associated with being a reservist in today's operational environment. Herron, who was an Active Duty and Reserve component Soldier, explains how the events of September 11, 2001 resulted in the mobilization of hundreds of thousands of reservists. Mobilizations for OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM and OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM are expected to continue at their current pace for the foreseeable future. This increase in deployment for a part-time force structure comes with a cost. More frequent and lengthy reserve obligations put stress on employers who face management decisions that affect the reservist. Recognizing the potential implication for reservists now may enable timely policy or force structure changes to ward off the impact on the military employee when they are needed the most (Herron, 2004).

In *The Minuteman*, former Senator Gary Hart concedes that at the end of the twentieth century the U.S. military became the largest, most powerful and technically advanced military power on earth, but the U.S. remained stuck in a vacuum with limited threats facing it. It did however have to contend with the possibility of a massive restructuring. Senator Hart proposed a size reduction for the massive U.S. Cold War Active Duty Army and an increase to the numbers of citizen's for an "Army of the people" (Hart, 1998, 1). He elaborated that the twenty-first century threats that the U.S. would face were not primarily military and, therefore, they could not be defeated by traditional conventional armies. The current threats are more culturally based and will best be answered, if at all, by national unity, which itself will be strengthened by citizen-

soldiers and restoration of an army of the people (Hart, 1998, 171). The relevance of Hart's concerns about the reserves and employers remains important and is considered in this thesis.

In the book *The Future of the Citizen Soldier*, MAJ (now Major General) Jeffrey A. Jacobs outlines his first hand experiences with the reserve and the active components of the U.S. Army. All reserve units have their positive and negative traits and issues. The reservist is in many ways different from the Active Component soldier and must be dealt with according to a set of standards (retention and civilian employment) unlike that of the active duty (AD) and active guard and reserve (AGR) soldiers.

An active component soldier or a civilian may never fully comprehend the challenges facing the reserve components because the active soldier or civilian, for the most part, has never worked a civilian job during the week, attempted to ready an Army unit for war and raised a family simultaneously (Jacobs, 1993, 123). The issues and complexities affecting reservists are increased significantly compared to most active duty soldiers and civilians because of the need to satisfy their employers in addition to their families and military leadership. The balancing act remains a difficult task and is compounded by long and frequent deployments.

Dr. Charles Heller's book, *Twenty-First Century Force: A Federal Army and a Militia*, presents the historical significance and relevance between the Federal Reserve and State Militia of the early 1900s and the operational reserve component of today. The importance of maintaining a fully staffed and operational reserve today and in the future remain as crucial today as reserve forces were during the initial development of our nation. Legalities surrounding Reserve Component soldier's dual status as citizens and

soldiers remain today (USERRA, 1994). Similar issues were present during the initial stages of the all-volunteer force development. The first steps were taken to create this 20th century force with National Guard reform contained in the 1903 Dick Act. The Dick Act created an understanding that reserve forces in peace and war would be deemed a recognized and necessary component of the Army (Jacobs, 1994).

In 1908 following the Dick Act of 1903, the Army sought and obtained the creation of a responsive Federal Reserve. Later the National Defense Act of 1916 declared the Federal Reserve and National Guard to be Reserve Components of the Army along with the Regulars (Army), Federal volunteers and conscripts as parts of the whole or Total Army (Heller, 2004, vii). Legislation that followed continued to balance the need for refinement of reserve component guidelines and employer support structures. The Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) of 1994 also known as the Veterans' Reemployment Rights Act (VRRA), which was enacted as section 404 of the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 all followed the echoing of the need to retain the reserve component force.

The creation of an all-volunteer force brought with it issues that would manifest themselves over time. The reluctance of the U.S. government to build and retain a large active duty military force extends the need to rely more heavily on reserve components to meet increased mission requirements, especially in time of war or protracted conflict (Commission, 2008). Reliance on the reserve components during time of national emergencies or disasters also solidifies the need to retain full employer support. Much like in the past, national security relies on reserve retention and employer support.

During periods of calm when utilization of the reserve component remains nil, the U.S. government has overlooked employer support. During periods of unrest and turmoil when America and the U.S. government call, the reserve and employer are willing to adapt. Levels of civilian employer support to the reservist have varied over time. This has been true from the beginning of reserve component history to the present. The difference is that with the passing of time American culture, values, and standards of living have changed (Benko, 2007). The importance of understanding the employers support role (both to the employer and from the employer) becomes more evident. What was ever done to support the employer? Today, America maintains an unprecedented reliance on the reserve component. Twenty-First Century military deployments reiterate the need to support the employer if for no other reason than our national security.

Innumerable reservists look to the *Army Times Newspaper* to remain current on military issues, changing regulations and requirements. Although this magazine is not an official Army publication, the information in the magazine is accurate most of the time. The August 2007 issue contained the annual bonus “Guard and Reserve 2007 Handbook.” This sixty-two page handbook contains information pertinent to critical issues and benefits concerning the ARNG and USAR. In the section titled Activation there are no paragraphs sub-titled Involuntary Activation, Full Mobilization (10 U.S.C. 12301), Partial Mobilization (10 U.S.C. 12302), Partial Mobilization (10 U.S.C. 12304) or Voluntary Mobilization (Army Times, 2007). Nor was there any mention of the reserve being an operational and expeditionary force. These key considerations cannot continue to be overlooked.

This handbook is much like *The Reserve Forces Almanac*, published annually; they provide useful and important information for every U.S. reserve component force. Under the section entitled Affiliation (Army Times, 2007) and in the 2007 *Reserve Forces Almanac*, there was mention of the ARNG, Ready Reserve, Selected Reserve, Drilling Reservists and Units, Training Pipeline, Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMA), Active Guard and Reserve (AGR), Individual Ready Reserve (IRR), Inactive National Guard, Standby Reserve (active and inactive status) and the Retired Reserve but, no information about the shift from a strategic reserve, that we have known for nearly one-hundred years, to an operational reserve or what changes will be incurred by the employer. People ask at what point will the transformation become common knowledge and what will the reactions by reservists and their employers be as a result? Numerous *Army Times Newspaper* articles were reviewed for this thesis. The articles reviewed include those related to transformation, reservists and their employers.

Congress emphasizes continuity and the VRRRA intention to clarify and strengthen USERRA. Congress also emphasizes that Federal laws protecting veterans' employment and reemployment rights for the past 110 years have been successful and that the large body of documented case law that was developed under those statutes remains in full force and effect, to the extent it is consistent with USERRA. USERRA authorized the Department of Labor to publish regulations implementing the VRRRA for State, local government, and private employers. USERRA also authorizes the Office of Personnel Management to issue regulations implementing the Act for Federal executive agencies (other than some Federal intelligence agencies). USERRA established a separate program for employees of some Federal intelligence agencies (USERRA, 1994, 1002.3).

Although USERRA and VRRRA established laws and provided guidelines for reservists and their employers, the acts did not have insight of reserve component transformation to an operational force. Operational force issues are applied to the USERRA and VRRRA strategic reserve framework. Applicability to the operational reserve will require new legislation and possible amendments to USERRA and VRRRA that better apply to today's reserve and employer. The laws that impact USERRA and VRRRA continue to evolve. The USERRA and VRRRA was researched and referenced in this study. Legal issues and changes to representative agencies and enforcement organizations like the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (NCESGR), Department of Labor (DOL) remain a continuous source of reference and baseline for guidance and research.

Newspaper articles from the "New York Times" and "Washington Post" also remain a continuous source of relevant and up to date information relating to the employer. The articles researched remain subject to scrutiny and implied personal biases on the part of each reporter but are considered as relevant to this thesis. Newspaper articles reviewed include researched topics on the reservist, their civilian employers, reserve OPTEMPO, USAR and ARNG, deployments and legal issues. All research has been considered from a standpoint of the reserve component as an operational force.

Much documentation is available about the employer and the strategic reserve prior to September 11, 2001. However, unity of effort by Congress is difficult to obtain when it comes to fully supporting employers of the operational reserve force. There is little specific documentation available on the operational reserve since its inception. There are a number of published writings, presidential directives, scholarly articles, and

several monographs, theses and articles that highlight, emphasize, identify and propose solutions to the problem of how to best support the employer in a way that will insure an operational expeditionary reserve component force for the future. That said, only a very small body of research is available highlighting and emphasizing the problem and solutions of support directly to the employer while maintaining an operational reserve. The researcher discovered minimal previous research on support to the civilian employer that proposes a solution to this glaring and critical problem.

In Chapter Three, the researcher lays out the methodology and criteria for comparing and selecting feasible options that can be adopted by Congress to support the employer. Chapter Three identifies the key issues that affect the employer. Explained are the distinct options available for creating success to support both the reserves and employers. This study also determines which option, if any, is the most promising method for supporting the employer. Further assessments are made to determine each method's feasibility and acceptability if recommended to Congress. Positive and negative impacts to the reserves and employers are assessed. This study seeks to optimize national security and reflect a solidly supported civilian employer and future operational reserve component force.

The Commission on the National Guard and Reserves Final Report to Congress and the Secretary of Defense outlines and addresses many relevant concerns, issues and complexities surrounding the transformation to an operational reserve component force. The report underscores the need to fully support employers and retain the operational reserve. Increased reliance on the civilian/military experience pool in the future during time of crisis will serve to benefit both the civilian populace/employment sector and the

U.S. military. Dollar-for-dollar, the commission determined that, economically, retention of the reserve component force remains less costly to retain than active duty forces (Commission, 2008). The commission commends that the monetary savings factor alone solidifies the need to fully support reservists and their employers with a support structure in the future. Many other suggestions and conclusions drawn in the final report that directly impact the total force will not be addressed in this study.

New and innovative methods that provide employers support are considered and implemented when appropriate. The U.S. Army Reserve Employer Partnerships program is one unique way for the Army Reserve and civilian employers to support each other while saving money and retaining the operational reserve component force. Corporate presentations and business outreach programs continue to build reserve and civilian business partnerships. Presentations made by USAR representatives to corporate America further establish relationships between reservists, their families, and employers. These presentations are assessed in this study with the understanding that they are in their initial development and implementation stages.

The ESGR continues to support newly developed employer support initiatives. Presentations made by ESGR representatives to corporations and businesses that improve employer awareness of reserve structure change and identify new trends and programs that support the employer are analyzed in this study. The USAR and ESGR continue to work together in their efforts to support reservists, their families, and all civilian employers.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN (METHODOLOGY)

Since 1908, the citizen soldier volunteer has served the United States in time of need. The formation of the operational reserve requires increased translation of support to the employer. The historical research conducted and described to this point examines how Congress supports the employer as a part of national security. In reality responsibility for national security is borne by the civilian employer, reservist and their families. The U.S. is not the only nation that faces complexities in the relationship between reservists and their employers. Many countries that rely heavily on reserve forces emplace employer support mechanisms that facilitate reservist support. Every country has its own unique situation; therefore no specific countries are referenced in this thesis because there are so many of them. Some employer support mechanisms used in other countries are adoptable by Congress.

Research for this thesis uses the model of Clausewitz' "paradoxical trinity" theory as viewed by those most impacted by reserve component transformation to an operational force - the reservist, family and the civilian employer. Potential strategic impacts may result if employer support issues remain unaddressed. The three critical points of this research are centered on the military (reserve component/reservist) replacing the Government (chance/probabilities) portion of the original paradoxical trinity theory. Critical to support of the military portion of the model is the reservist. Without the reservist the model and national security alike would falter.

The reservist also impacts the family. Since the reservist is usually the male - but not always - and in most cases the provider for the family, any impact either positive or

negative to the reservist will impact the family. The family portion of the “paradoxical trinity” theory represents the passion portion.

Civilian employment represents the reason/rationality portion of the “paradoxical trinity” theory. The civilian employer serves as the reason/rationality factor by imparting vision and understanding that without the civilian employer support to reservists the reserve component force of the future may dissolve. The reservist will face difficulties in finding and retaining civilian employment and therefore the reservist’s family loses its support structure and primary income source. Issues centered on each of the three critical points and their direct relationships to each other remain questionable if the civilian employer is not adequately supported.

This thesis links the employer issues identified in chapter two’s literature review and chapter four containing research analysis as they identify viable options that will answer the question of “how will the Department of Defense (DoD) minimize the impact on the reservists’ civilian employers in order to maintain an operational reserve component force?” Identified options that support the employer and the operational reserve can be applied to the model of Clausewitz’ “paradoxical trinity” theory. This model forms a trinity between reservists, families and civilian employers, thus successfully providing a means of maintaining the future operational reserve.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Chapter Three of this thesis identifies a way by which the primary and secondary research questions can be answered. These questions are: “how can the Department of Defense (DoD) minimize the impact on the reservists’ civilian employers in order to maintain an operational reserve component force?” To fully understand the importance of supporting employers it is also necessary to consider several secondary research questions. These questions include: What factors affect a person’s decision to join and remain in the reserves? What is the best way to support employers? What are the potential civilian and military implications of not fully supporting employers?

Viable options are analyzed to better answer the primary and secondary research questions. The options include methods that make sense and support the employer. Based on all research material identified in Chapter Two of this thesis, one factor remains true throughout: The employer is a key player in retention of the operational Reserve Component force. The findings and analysis in this chapter are considered relative to the following factors: civilian employers and employment, the reservist, legal issues, government, civilian employer mitigation, civilian factors, military recruitment; and retention and civilian employer support alternatives. Little documentation was available regarding direct support to employers. Although there are other military forces throughout the world that use reserve forces, time constraints limited research to viable options applicable to American employers.

Civilian Employers and Employment

The main support structure behind reservists is framed by civilian employment. Employers ultimately sustain reservists and their families. If operational Reserve Component forces are expected to remain as such in the future, steps taken now to care for employers will ensure total force longevity. Both documented facts (employment applications) and non-documented factors (verbal questions/inferences) are taken into consideration when employers interview reservists for potential hiring. Barriers are created for the reservist that seeks civilian employment. Hiring reservists becomes more difficult if not impossible for employers who face greater loss by employing operational reservists.

Constraints are placed on the reservist by employers in the form of delayed civilian promotions, positional assignments and in other ways because of obligations incurred by military service. In some cases reservists may manipulate their work attendance by using their status as an excuse to legally absent themselves from their civilian employment. A balance and understanding between reservists and employers is critical to their partnership. Many factors apply and truly determine whether a reservist is considered value added or a hindrance to employers.

Having an operational Reserve and staying in touch with America through civilian employers is important. Since 1989, the size of the U.S. military was reduced in manpower by thirty to forty percent with fifty-four percent of the Army's soldiers remaining in the Reserve Components. Today, the Reserve Component force comprises over forty percent of the nation's armed forces. The U.S. government and its citizens (civilian employers) must provide maximum support to the nation's service men and

women if “business as usual” is desired by the civilian workforce during this period of protracted conflict.

In the 2007 Veterans Day Message, LTG Jack C. Stultz, Chief, Army Reserve, and Commander, US Army Reserve Command, stated “the Soldier-Family-Employer triad provides a strong interconnected web of support for each other, and I am committed to focusing my energies and resources on strengthening that relationship. Army Reserve Warrior-Citizens, their Families and their Employers ensure the foundation of this country remains rock solid” (Stultz, 2007). This quotation reiterates the need to support reservists and their civilian employers.

The Reservist

Under the new operational force structure, the reservist is less likely to succeed in the civilian workforce. The constraints placed on the reservist echo (when publicized) to would-be civilian employers. Increased obligations serve as a critical determining factor in whether a reservist (who will be present 80% of the time over a five year period) is hired, promoted or retained by a civilian employer. The civilian who is not in the reserves will receive unacknowledged civilian employment and positional preference as a result.

Added stress is placed on reservists struggling in a civilian job market that is flooded with employment seekers, and raises the question whether to voluntarily serve ones country or not. There are many examples of reservists being considered “value added” when hired. But, there are equally as many reservists that are indirectly forced to take a back seat when being considered for civilian employment or other employee benefits strictly because of their reserve affiliation. All considerations up to this point in

time reflect the reservists issues experienced under the legacy reserve force structure. The majority of employers in the United States have no knowledge of the new operational reserve structure or the obligations that are required of today's reservist (Commission, 2008).

When the operational reserve structure becomes common knowledge among employers at all levels (local, state, and federal), the difficulty placed on reservists to obtain or retain a solid civilian career and profession will be further complicated. Reservists, in turn, will be forced to consider alternatives if they desire employment with career potential. Their alternatives are a) not to join or re-enlist in the reserves, b) to remain in the reserves and sacrifice in the employment sector or c) to continue to pursue both the reserves and civilian employment with increased difficulties expected.

In the October 22, 2007 *Army Times* newspaper, "Guard, Reserve Set to Take on Large New Role", General Charles Campbell, Commanding General of Forces Command (FORSCOM) stated there are six tasks that must be accomplished to transform the ARNG and USAR. Two of the tasks relate to this thesis. 1) Adopt pre-mobilization and post-mobilization training cycles: Fixed training/deployment cycles will allow for retention of a twelve month Reserve mobilization. 2) Adapt a Reserve Component generating force: A Reserve re-generation force includes increasing support for the mission of recruiting sufficient numbers of Reserve Component troops. Incentives adopted by Congress inspire others and better sustain citizen-soldiers and employers. Types of incentives include improving medical care and other benefits, gaining and retaining civilian employers' support and improving stability so that soldiers are better able to pursue their civilian careers. To merely offer a civilian employer increased

deployment visibility and some predictability is a hollow benefit with no substance. This so-called incentive offers essentially nothing to employers and reservists given their increased role and responsibility. Transformation to an operational reserve requires a high level of acceptance and support from employers.

Legal Issues

Although laws and regulations remain in place to prevent most types of discrimination against reservists being hired, retained or advancing in the civilian workforce, these practices do occur (USERRA, 2004). A Military.com study, dated November 5, 2007, revealed a profound disconnect between employers and military personnel transitioning from military service to the civilian workforce (Military, 2007). The study revealed that many employers are largely uninformed about legal obligations concerning employees who are reservists. While the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) of 1994 serves as a readily available guide and source of information to all employers, civilian employers remain unsure about reservist policies and laws. The new requirements placed on the reservist and the employer as a result of transformation to an operational force has yet to be fully explained to employers. The laws leave little room for interpretation by subordinate government entities while maintaining the flexibility to adapt as unidentified situations arise. These laws protect reservists and state, local and federal employers. Problems arise when individual government entities attempt to interpret and apply these laws or the words in the laws for their own benefit.

Employer issues and difficulties continue to mount. In a *Washington Post* article stating that “obtaining civilian employment proves most critical of ARNG soldier’s

duties, responsibilities and potential call to war” Charles S. Ciccolella, the U.S. Department of Labor’s Assistant Secretary for Veterans' Employment and Training Service (VETS), said he recognizes that after reservists leave their jobs for one or two tours, there is a "big impact on the employer," who either has to hire temporary help or do without (Davenport, 2007). The reservist jobseekers, who are asked specific questions regarding their military service, may face not being hired as a result of disclosing their military affiliation. The potential for this type of discriminatory behavior will be greatly compounded when civilian employers are informed and knowledgeable of the “new” operational reserve structure.

The effects of reserve transformation to an operational force continue to surface. Action taken immediately to eliminate negative support from employers is in the best interest of everyone. Employers and reservists must remain fully supported. Soldiers who do choose to leave the reserves or Active Duty (AD) deserve to do so with a good feeling from their service to the nation. "We want our service members to have a best last impression of the military," said Charles S. Ciccolella, a retired Army colonel. "They are our best recruiters when they get out." The unemployment rate for veterans (which includes reservists who have been called to active duty) ages 20 to 24 dropped from a high in 2005 of almost 16 percent to about 10 percent in 2006. But it is still higher than non-veterans in that age category, who had a jobless rate of 8 percent. The national unemployment rate last year was 4.6 percent (Davenport, 2007, A14).

Reservists serve America by remaining trained and ready, fighting wars and conflicts, and serving in periods of national disasters. While engaged in military service, reservists are absent from their civilian workplace. Sometimes after reservists return to

their civilian employment, they are faced with another type of war, one that should not have to be fought. This new fight is, in most cases, over doing what is right by reservists who willingly place their life on the line so that not only employers but all Americans remain free. After returning from combat, the last thing reservists want or should have to face is another war, with their employer, that will sometimes last for years. An option reservists should not have to take regarding their employment is choosing not to seek help to retain their job or benefits fearing that it “is not worth the fight” (Associated Press, 2007).

Reservists are sometimes reluctant to file complaints about employers because they face an ill-defined process on how to file a complaint. The exact process to file a complaint is not well understood by reservists and employers. Lack of complaint process clarity compounds reservists and employers motivation difficulties in raising a complaint. Reassurance, which guarantees some action will be taken in a timely manner, is also a concern of reservists. Other reservists still have a lack of confidence in the system believing they would not win their case/complaint so complaints are never voiced. Some reservists believe that they will face employer reprisal if they file a complaint against their employer, and in many cases this is true.

The expectation that reservist/employer issues will increase with an operational reserve is a definite reason for the DoD and Congress to structure policy that will fully support both employers and reservists. Prior ESGR policy execution included providing education to reservists on their and their employer’s rights and the process for complaints. The education program was discontinued but the operational force and its complexities for reservists and employers revealed that the education policy should be

reintroduced by ESGR. The more knowledgeable reservists and employers are about the operational reserve the more cohesively they will work.

Currently, the United States is fully engaged in a period of protracted conflict which has no end in sight. The Active Component forces of the Military are exhausted and the increased usage and reliance on reserves prompts the need for drastic restructuring of the reserves and more importantly, their relationship with their support base (civilian employers). In particular, transformation of the reserves from their traditional role as a legacy force to the role of an operational force requires a new approach to maintaining employer support.

Government

Properly applied governmental benefits that strengthen the employer will produce the desired end result of a robust operational reserve. All government leaders involved in the decision making process, from the national to the local municipality level, must consider all issues in determining future national security and support of the employer. The roles, obligations and decision-making responsibilities that leaders have and the driving forces behind their decisions, down to the individual articulation of words, deserve consideration. Leadership visions for the United States continue to impact the all-volunteer force. Future leaders at all levels must openly accept and support employers during transformation to an operational force. Whether employment/employer organizations (unions and collective bargaining units) and government agencies are working together to clearly identify and provide resolutions to reservist's issues remains to be seen. Taking the requisite action will alleviate controversy surrounding the reservist's voluntary service, negative affects on their families, civilian employers and

careers. In this rapidly changing paradigm of reserves transforming to an operational force, the documenting of change continues but employers whose are ultimately affected remain the least informed.

When reservists encounter problems, or even if they have a question regarding their treatment/rights by their employer, where do they turn for help and action? The usual process goes something like this: The affected reservist tries to clarify and fix the employer issue by communicating with the employer and reserve chain of command. If the reservist is unsuccessful, they then contact the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (NCESGR), a DoD agency. After they thoroughly review the complaint, they may choose to contact the reservist and the employer and attempt to mediate a resolution to the issue or problem. NCESGR assigns a case number to the complaint and with any hope, the dispute would be resolved informally. If this effort fails, the reservist typically can approach the U.S. Department of Labor (DoL) to pursue a formal complaint and possible litigation by the U.S. Department of Justice.

The timeliness of case resolution and also the effectiveness of the agencies remains a concern for the affected reservist. For the reservist who counts on having the backing of “Uncle Sam,” if needed, after returning to civilian employment from war, there is no overwhelming confidence in today’s support system. In a recent article titled “reservists losing jobs while at war,” the DoL states “educate, don’t litigate.” At a time when lawmakers are saying that the system is broken, one senator called the procedures for veterans seeking help a confusing “Walter Reed-like nightmare” (*The Buffalo News*, 2007, D7).” Evidence continues to mount for the need to provide better support to the employer. With the pending realization by employers that the new operational force

structure will remove the reservist more frequently and for long periods of time will come the need for a solid employer support structure with U.S. Government backing. The current organizations will not suffice to help America's reservists and their employers in the future.

Two primary agencies oversee investigations on reported violations of reservist's job rights. The US DoL and the US Office of Special Counsel (OSC) both handle alleged employer violations of USERRA (Assistant, 2002). Given that each respective agency has different personnel funding and resource allocations, the timeliness of action and clarity to any given case or complaint may vary. Although the timeliness of resolution for reservist complaints has improved over the past few years a growing number of reservists still do not know where to turn for reputable legal assistance regarding their reservist/civilian employer issues (Army, October 22, 2007). The expectation that there will continue to be an increase in reservist/civilian employer complaints is real. With the advent of the post surge drawdown of forces in Iraq and the increased civilian employer understanding of the "new" operational reserve will come more reservist complaints that will need quick and direct litigation. The importance of today's reserve forces to national security requires solid support and prompt action in litigation. The litigation processes must be clear and swift in order to best support reservists and employers.

USERRA remains a good set of congressionally approved legislation that provides regulations and reservist protections. The laws themselves remain subject to refinement and improvement. All employers and reservists do not accept and abide by the laws prescribed by USERRA. The Air Transportation and Security Act denies Transportation Security Agency (TSA) security screeners and their supervisors holding

critical positions from employment protections afforded to other employees by USERRA laws (Military, February 23, 2008). This type of exception is necessary to keep critical staff in their positions and maintain national security. Employment protections for American citizens that voluntarily choose to serve the nation are sometimes selectively applied if in the interest of national security.

In the GWOT, the will of the nation to stay on course and not further erode full support to the civilian employer is paramount. Current Army leaders have matured in a culture where they were taught what to think, not how to think. This principle is critical in determining the level of reservist support expected from civilian employers. Support to the civilian employer and innovative thinking has not been encouraged. Leaders must quickly determine and understand that the road to reserve success is through thinking outside the norm with civilian employers.

Rather than focusing on what the civilian employer can do for the reserves, Congress and DoD should ask, "What is the most affective thing they themselves can do from the perspective of fostering civilian employer growth in reserve acceptance?" By asking this question, Congress and DoD will begin to acknowledge that they have a stake and that their actions can either enhance or degrade civilian employer support in maintaining the reserve. Actions in support of the civilian employer can serve to influence the civilian employer decision cycle to hire, retain, and most importantly support the reservist. As an Army, we must be expeditionary and capable of quickly responding to the changing needs of our nation (Commission, 2008). Without the support of the civilian employer, without involving the whole fabric of society in the

undertaking of war, prolonged military operations in support of our national interests remain questionable (Foresman, 2007).

To the reservist, incentives provided to their employers will ease the difficulties of dual-status. Prior to the terrorist attacks of 9-11-2001 reservists trained on a one weekend a month and two weeks of annual training (AT). This schedule was comfortable for the civilian employer who could either allow the reservist time off or allow the reservist to use accrued vacation time for AT. Reservist absenteeism and workplace disruption remained minimal (Rand, 1992). Thus workplace scheduling conflicts resulting from duty were minimal. Existing laws and policies clarify most reservist/civilian employer conflicts (USERRA, 1994). Additionally, DoD established the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR). ESGR is a partially funded and partially volunteer organization that supports the Reservist and civilian employer by helping to resolve issues that arise (Employer, 2007). The ESGR's approach to civilian employers lacks a strategy to achieve reserve support from employers.

Civilian Employer Mitigation

The potential negative effects of the operational reserve on the civilian employer can be mitigated by establishing Government enforced policies that better direct employers concerning employing and retaining reservists. Local and state employers and governments desiring federal grant monies need to be better leveraged to support both the United States and the operational reserve. Continued legislation and benefits that support reservists, their families and civilian employers will only serve to strengthen the new operational reserve forces of the United States.

Two major Army transformation initiatives are under way, but their effect on reserve component readiness is unclear. These Army initiatives, the creation of modular units and the development of a force generation model to provide more predictability to unit rotations, are intended to enhance the ability of both active and reserve units to conduct 21st century operations. However, implementation plans for these initiatives are still evolving, funding plans lack sufficient details and could change, and the risks associated with the initiatives have not been clearly identified (Weitz, 2007). As a result, the potential impact of these initiatives on the reserve components' sustainability as part of a 21st century operational force is very uncertain. Further details about how both of these initiatives will work are critical so that national decision makers can make accurate assessments, manage risk, and ensure that the initiatives will result in a sustainable model for the reserves that will provide adequate levels of readiness commensurate with expected roles and missions of the ARNG and USAR (GAO-06-745, 2006).

The Government Accounting Office (GAO) has undertaken work regarding the changing roles and readiness of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve (GAO, 2002). Congress gave the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves (Commission) a very significant charge, which was useful to the Commission in its deliberations on how reserve forces should be structured and equipped for the 21st century given new threats to national security, both overseas and at home. Ongoing operations in Afghanistan and Iraq have required the involvement of large numbers of reservists, particularly ground forces, and the DOD now faces the unprecedented challenge of sustaining large-scale, long-duration operations with an all-volunteer military force (Commission, 2008).

Since 2001, over 500,000 reservists have been mobilized in support of ongoing operations, the largest mobilization of reserve forces since World War II (Commission, 2007). The high pace of operations has led to personnel and equipment shortages among Army Reserve Component units. Further, in addition to its traditional homeland missions, such as responding to storms and fighting forest fires, the ARNG's homeland missions have expanded to include guarding against terrorist threats (GAO-06-962, 2006). Civilian employers remain greatly affected by today's military operational tempo (OPTEMPO). In the transformation from a strategic reserve force to an operational reserve force, some adaptations may be necessary to modernize the current mobilization authorities for reserve forces as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Current Mobilization Authorities for Reserve Forces

Statute	Provisions
10 U.S.C. 12301(a)	Declared by Congress:
“Full Mobilization”	In time of war or national emergency No limit on numbers of soldiers called to active duty For duration of war plus 6 months
10 U.S.C. 12302	Declared by the President:
“Partial Mobilization”	In time of national emergency No more than 1,000,000 Reservists can be on active duty No more than 24 consecutive months
10 U.S.C. 12304	Determined by the President:
“Presidential Reserve Call-up”	To augment the active duty force for operational missions No more than 200,000 Reservists can be on active duty No more than 270 days

Source: GAO analysis of *U.S. Code* provisions

Certain restrictions and conditions associated with the operational reserve such as twelve month rotations, consecutive tours to different areas of operation, and the ARFORGEN cycle may require that table 1 be further modified. This table outlines the current mobilization authorities not yet adjusted to coincide with the new operational reserve strategy. Portions requiring further analysis and possible change are: the call-up authority, determining body or position, the number of soldiers/units, and the time duration. For purposes of this study, in-depth analysis is not done on the mobilization authority and policy.

Military Recruitment and Retention

One of the most publicized new programs in the Army Reserve is the referral bonus. The program originally offered a \$1,000 bonus to Soldiers who referred applicants who join the Army Reserve and who complete their initial military training. This bonus was later increased to \$2,000 and was also made available to active duty and reservist retirees (USAR Posture statement, 2007). The questions that need to be asked are: Was the program productive and fully supported by the thousands of service members who were required to register to participate in it? What will the end results of the initiative be? Is the program a long term solution to reserve retention and recruitment deficiencies? Or is the program an attempt to entice soldiers to independently recruit people to join the military to eliminate potential shortfalls in recruiting efforts stemming from transformation to an operational force?

On November 5, 2007, a new Army program dubbed "Active First" promises up to \$60,000 in bonuses to recruits who opt for 30 to 48 months of active duty then transfer to the ARNG. Recruits who sign on under the program receive \$20,000 for 30 months of active service, \$30,000 for 36 months and \$40,000 for 48 months all paid after completion of basic and job training or military occupational specialty (MOS) completion. After active service, soldiers may opt to re-enlist in the active Army or take an additional \$20,000 to serve their remaining obligation in the ARNG. Many active duty soldiers traditionally move to the ARNG after their enlistments (Military.com, 2007). The new initiative applies a temporary answer to some transformation issues and fails to answer any reservist and civilian employer issues. If the operational reserve seeks increased recruitment of the most motivated and qualified civilians, enticements such as

possible retirement and retirement collection after twenty years of reserve component service for those who join the operational reserve forces may be a solution that yields positive long-term strategic results.

The slow and steady increase to monetary retention and recruitment bonuses, some nearing \$150,000 per soldier, reemphasizes the need for a more focused strategic plan. On face value alone, the bonus money spent to recruit and retain reservists can be better leveraged if applied to the civilian employer. This type of large monetary application will have a lasting strategic impact on employers. Employer support to the reservist and national security will improve. Reservists civilian career expectations and opportunities will broaden and their desire to join and remain in the reserves will improve. A reserve support base established by the people (America) for the people (civilian employers and Reservists) remains the only long-term solution to retention and recruitment of the all volunteer operational force. These ideas, if implemented, could provide reservists stability and opportunity while serving their country. Simultaneously, employers retain “buy-in” and a sense of pride and ownership in their reservist/employee. If leveraged properly, the employer, reservist, and national security benefit and prosper well into the future.

Applying incentives that improve employer support is only half the battle in retaining an operational reserve. The other half of the battle is directed at reservists and their benefits. A positive benefit properly applied for the reservist, such as early retirement, augments civilian employer incentives. Some initial increases in reserve retirements are expected, but for those that retire and return to the civilian sector, their recruitment value will remain unequalled. Improvements to the reserve component

retirement system and long-term tangible benefits along with employer incentives aid in reserve recruitment and retention while easing burdens to potential employers. Young civilians and old alike view the retired reservist as successful, having engaged in a part time career with a tangible retirement, which is collectable at a relatively early age. Equally, middle age civilians also see this benefit. Both classes of civilians (young and middle aged) are potentially more apt to seek employment in the reserves because of the benefits offered.

With these improvements, reserve service will again, as in the early 1980s, provide for a period of increased competition among those civilians that desire to succeed and have increased opportunity in their future careers. As it now stands, the reserve incentive programs and policy of applying bonuses of from \$1,000 - \$60,000+ will entice the Soldier or civilian for the short-term, but it will not provide an incentive that will assure retention during this period of protracted conflict and strategic transformation to an operational force. In short, the USAR incentive programs are a temporary fix to a significant problem. The application of monetary bonuses as an enticement to maintain the required reserve military force strength and national security will not endure over time. As employers become aware of the new operational force requirements on reservists, their desire to employ reservists will be reduced.

If the Congress takes a similar approach with the civilian employer as the DoD is taking with the reservist, by applying large monetary incentives to aid the employer, the same objective will be achieved. Governmental support to employers is now perceived as non-existent. This lack of support to employers does not and should not be perceived as meaning that the employer is not patriotic or supportive to service men and women.

Most civilian employers do what they can to support the reservist. However, employers are in the business of conducting and functioning as a business to make a profit.

Businesses realize and react to money (Census, 2001). When a reservist is absent from the civilian workforce, businesses lose money (Commission, 2008).

In the 2007 Veterans Day Message, LTG Jack C. Stultz, Chief, Army Reserve, and Commander, US Army Reserve Command, stated “The Soldier-Family-Employer triad provides a strong interconnected web of support for each other.” He also stated that he is “committed to focusing his energies and resources on strengthening that relationship.” Army Reserve Warrior-Citizens, their families and their Employers ensure the foundation of this country remains rock solid (Stultz, Veterans Day, 2007).” This message is great; however, reservists and their employers will require the support of Congress and the entire U.S. Government through the use of smart and well focused initiatives that will directly influence and positively strengthen this country’s foundation. The transformation of the Reserve Component to an operational force and the long war compels such action.

One of the most overlooked words in reserve forces’ recruitment and retention tactics and policies is “career.” The USAR career counselors, who are geographically dispersed in 12 regions, need Congress to approve key career and longevity enhancing benefits, which will help enable the Reserve Components to continue to meet and exceed the needs of America’s expeditionary Army in transformation to an operational force. The term career implies that something is for the long-term. When a civilian initially joins the reserves, recruiters could then promote the potential career and life-long benefits associated with military service. For the past twenty years, the author has searched for

another part-time job or better yet, a profession, like the military, that offers a benefit package that includes a retirement like that of the reserves, but the end result is there are not any such jobs or opportunities in the United States.

Commensurate with the word career is the word opportunity. Between the two words, for a young civilian seeking long-term benefits, employment stability, unlimited potential and opportunities that are endless, the decision to join the all-volunteer reserves of the United States should be an easy decision. “Patriotism” remains a consideration which should make the decision easy. The present focus is on flooding the United States with recruiters to achieve a short-term solution. Instead, policy makers and DoD should work to establish a solid and robust incentive package including a visible and attainable part-time employment retirement incentive program that will cause all Americans to desire the career opportunities offered by the reserves.

The “retaining a reserve force dilemma” does not mention the fact that the part-time reserve military career is achievable while simultaneously pursuing a civilian career and educational ambitions that may ultimately greatly enhance each other. During this time of critical military strategy and structure shift, it is imperative for the sustainment of the nation that the long-term benefit of reserve forces military service be optimized. If the United States continues with its present recruitment and retention methodology, eventually options of national service or conscription will have to be considered to maintain operational force manning, national security and the American way of life. Service in the reserves continues in some way to impact the relationship between reservists, their families and their employers. Conversely, all three categories of those affected will also affect the military and National Security Strategy. Congress and the

DoD have an opportunity now to set a better course and to remain in the driver's seat. All legal action that Congress takes (or fails to take) will cause the revitalization (or degradation) of the operational reserve forces of the United States.

The location of Reserve Centers in proximity to reservists' homes also remains an issue. The latest Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC) policies and the consolidation of reserve facilities onto military installations is a concern for both reservists and employers. Reserve force sustainability and support to reservists and their employers far removed from a Reserve Center creates additional travel and added time away from employers, and is therefore a serious concern for both retention and civilian employment. A detailed analysis on this issue is not conducted in this study due to time constraints, but warrants further examination.

Civilian Factors

Successful transformation to an operational reserve will require a hard look at how use of the reserves impacts civilian employers. In the past twenty-five years, the reservist, a volunteer, contracted to serve in the reserves for a period of time. Excluding training requirements reservists performed unit "drills" or meetings generally one weekend a month and two weeks during the summer (Annual Training). These requirements were acknowledged and easily accepted by most civilian employers. In time of war or call-up, reservists would answer the call to active military service. The Strategic Reserve possessed a structure that became well-known to reservists, their families and civilian employers. The structure allowed for reservists to pursue both a civilian profession and obtain additional education while also maintaining a family. A

fully supported employer facilitates reserve retention and family acceptance of the operational reserve.

Under the operational force structure, reservists also serve one weekend a month in an inactive duty for training (IDT) status and two weeks for annual training each year. But reservists now remain programmed into a projected rotation schedule that will remove them from reserve status for at least one year out of every five. Reservists will serve on active duty augmenting active duty forces during this period of the long war. Success for the operational force structure, of course, assumes that the nation does not need the reservist sooner for other active duty service or for a longer duration of time than the projected one year. As a result of the change to an operational force structure, reservists have in fact now become not reservists as traditionally viewed but rather, they resemble a part-time active Army with new requirements added onto their initially understood role. The contract which reservists entered into with the government upon joining the legacy Reserve Component force now takes on a different appearance due to increased need and reliance on the reserves.

The impact on the reservists is compounded when their family and civilian employers are taken into consideration. The reservist is usually the sole provider for his/her family or in some cases a joint provider with a spouse. As the primary provider, reservists face not only an obligation to the United States but also to their family and employer. Reservists usually maintain civilian employment in addition to being a reservist. Civilian employment is considered to be the “bread and butter” for maintaining and sustaining reservists and their families. Forging relationships with employers and the community is fundamental to the success of the USAR mission (Stultz, 2007).

Civilian benefit packages are wide-ranging based on occupations, positions and more. At the top of the list of needs and cares for reservists and their families is healthcare, second only to financial stability. The traditional reservist cannot sustain either family healthcare or financial stability for a family on a reserve income alone. LTG Clyde Vaughn, Director of the Army National Guard, stated “when we ask more of a citizen-soldier, we have to compensate him commensurate to what he’s being asked to do” (*Army*, 2007, Oct 22). To institute a continuum of service means establishing a system that would allow soldiers to transition easily between the active component and the ARNG or USAR. Legislative changes to improve reserve component soldiers’ access to benefits may be required. Robert Smiley, Director of Reserve Affairs Integration in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, stated that some legislative priorities include pushing for better educational, medical and dental benefits, more full-time support for units, travel pay, better reintegration of reserve component soldiers and better retention bonuses.

All of these tasks are valid and meaningful to the reserves in some way. However, none of the tasks addresses the fundamental issue of support to the reservist’s civilian employer in this period of increased reliance on the new operational reserves. If issues surrounding reservists and their employers are properly addressed, several if not all of the tasks mentioned would be nullified. Numerous general officers mention that reservists, their families and civilian employers remain at the forefront of issues to be addressed. But seemingly few organizations take the initiative to execute the actions necessary to provide assistance to the employer.

If employers are adequately supported, reserve support from families and employers will improve. Employers would be fighting to employ reservists rather than fighting not to employ them. Complaints from reservists of improper treatment and discrimination would be reduced and efficiency from agencies such as the NCESGR and DOL would improve. Delaying full notification of employers across America of the reserve transformation to an operational expeditionary force will only impair civilian popular support to the reserves and indirectly the nation's national security. The reserve transformation to an operational force will have devastating consequences to national security if not properly marketed to insure civilian acceptance. As it currently stands, some new benefits such as monetary bonuses and small incentives are being applied to temporarily improve the reservists' situation, but the fundamental issue of reduced employer support over the long term, and its impact on reservists, is being ignored.

Definitive action must be taken by Congress and the general officer leadership of the Total Army to bring about the changes necessary to guarantee a future operational Reserve Component force. Acceptance and support will only happen when reservists' families and civilian employers across the nation know that their government supports them equally if not more than they support the reservists. Although there is some increase to currently limited reservist benefits, there is rarely mention of the government increasing benefits to reservists families and employers. The reality is, like in all other institutions and employment sectors, there is give and take when it comes to employee benefits. The U.S. Government and its relationship to the reserves are no different. The retirement, pay, promotion and benefit equality between the active army and the reserves remains an option in restructuring to an operational force.

In the *Army Times* article, “Guard, Reserve chiefs laud components’ evolution,” dated October 15, 2007, it is reported that the top officers for both the ARNG and the USAR (LTG Clyde Vaughn and LTG Jack Stultz) stated “the ARNG and the USAR have transformed into operational forces key to the missions in Afghanistan and Iraq and that they are confident that continued improvements will give soldiers and their families more stability while maintaining their presence in the fight overseas” (Army, 2007, Oct 15). At the beginning of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, the Guard and Reserve were constrained by Cold War policies and processes. These policies and processes were consistent with the legacy force structure that was prevalent up until that time and before transformation to the new operational force structure had evolved.

For today’s active duty military, constraints from Cold War policies and processes no longer exist when integrating the operational reserves. Constraint removal is very positive for the U.S. Army’s ability to conduct operations during the present period of protracted conflict. However, there has been only limited consideration given to the civilian employer during this process. The constraints that reservists’ employers faced and accommodated under the legacy reserve structure not only remain, but, are compounded by increased deployments caused by the reserve structure shift to an operational force. The *Army Times* and all interviews and articles researched for this thesis do not address this issue. The issues of support to the reservists’ employers remain to be addressed and to receive adequate attention and legitimate resolution by the nation’s leaders.

Transformation of the reserves to an operational force is ongoing. The mobilization authorizations listed in Table 1 reflect past reserve structure and usage, and

not the present operational force. Currently, soldiers and units are postured for call-up and deployment, in the near future or as the need for specialized soldiers (such as civil affairs) arises, and the soldier is solicited to sign a waiver form accepting the deployment and mobilization (this is done if the soldier already served for a previous operation). The waiver also reportedly serves as notification to the soldier that they may not receive thirty days of notice to report for the mobilization. This is done to eliminate the need for a presidential reserve involuntary call up as typically done when the need for reserve forces arose under the old reserve force structure. As the transformation to an operational reserve continues and the reliance on the reserves increases, the need to use soldiers over and over is evident. If reservists do not sign such a waiver, what will the DoD do to fill the force requirements?

Enough soldiers are usually found to support the volunteer requirements because many reservists lack solid full-time civilian employment or they are in college. But how will the quotas be filled when all soldiers are on their third and fourth deployment rotations? Is the mobilization authority's structure now irrelevant since the DoD transformed to an operational structure? Under the Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) model, which is currently in place for operational forces, reserves are set into a scheduled period of active duty service on a rotation basis for the foreseeable future. In effect, the operational force structure eliminates the need to have soldiers individually volunteer for long term operations that require unlimited troop rotations. The reservists rotation schedule is already, for the most part, pre-determined for them.

Since the inception of USAR and ARNG forces, reservists, as a whole, maintain civilian employment. As noted earlier in this chapter, civilian employers always provide

reservists a primary means of employment. Civilian employment serves as the reservist's main income and sustainment source. Prior to 9-11-2001 reserve commitment generally followed a one weekend a month and two weeks a year schedule (Herron, 2004). This schedule provided employers minimal reservist absenteeism and workplace disruption (Rand, 1992). Workplace scheduling and conflicts resulting from reserve duty were minimal. Laws and policies existed that clarified most reservist/civilian employer conflicts and issues (USERRA, 1994).

The Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA), adopted in 1994, has helped achieve its three objectives of 1) facilitating part-time military service by full-time civilian employees, 2) guaranteeing the reemployment of discharged military personnel and 3) preventing discrimination against individuals because of their military service primarily by acting as an ombudsman to mediate disputes. DoD established the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) to support reservists and employers to minimize the difficulties between the two (Employer, 2007). Today, however, ESGR contact and communication with employers lacks a workable strategy to achieve an appropriate level of operational reserve support. A Military.com study, dated November 5, 2007, reveals a profound disconnect between civilian employers and military personnel transitioning from military service to the civilian workforce (Military, 2007). The smooth transition for an operational reservist into and out of the civilian workforce requires more understanding, finesse, and agility.

A partnership brokered between employers and reservists that benefit the civilian employers will best sustain an operational Reserve (Military, 2008). Increased communication between DoL, DoD (ESGR) and employers on the benefits of employing

reservists is good. The addition by Congress of a tangible benefit to minimize losses by civilian employers during reservist absences would solidify the partnership, and would strengthen national security as a result of the mutually supported partnership. Issuing signed certificates to civilian employers acknowledging an understanding of reservist's rights under the pre 9-11-2001 reserve structure is not sufficient to address the operational reserve or the civilian employer obligations today (Rosseau, 2006). If a program is adopted to fully replace or reimburse employers that hire and retain reservists, Congress will have to supersede all other unions and collective bargaining agreements, which restrict the civilian employers from hiring part-time personnel, such as state and local police, fire, and other unionized agencies. Any such program will benefit the employer and the all volunteer force.

The terrorist attacks on 9-11-2001 sparked a transformation of the U.S. military. Reservists are now an operational force (Commission, January 31, 2008). Still obligated to fulfill enlistment contracts, reservists now deploy more frequently and for longer periods of time. Civilian employment is still maintained by reservists. Operational reserve employment is not designed to independently sustain reservists and their families. Therefore, reservists must maintain civilian employment. The civilian employer remains critical to reservists and to the national security. The impact on civilian employers' sacrifice because of reserve transformation to an operational force is significant. Reservists are away from their civilian employment more often and for longer periods of time. Threats against the United States continue to grow. The need to support reservists' civilian employers continues to change along with the U.S. National Security Strategy.

The required operational reserve force can be welcomed and supported if adequate support is provided to employers. The issue of support to the employer is magnified by the increased reliance on reserve forces. Reservists maintain civilian employment and encounter issues surrounding their dual-status (civilian and reserve) as they have throughout history. However, clearly defined laws and regulations supporting the civilian employer of operational reservists do not exist. Current laws and regulations remain tailored to the pre 9-11-2001 environment for reserve force requirements. Also, a full and complete notification of civilian employers of the new operational reserve structure has yet to occur. A better educated civilian employer on the intricacies of the operational force may ease further disruption in both the civilian workplace and the reserves. Exactly how the employer will react is yet to be realized. For civilian employers, personnel replacement, money, or some form of compensation may be required to relieve their increased loss in workforce (the reservist). Also, reservists' counter-actions to employer's reactions are yet to be determined. Reservists might quit the reserves, quit their civilian jobs, or attempt to maintain both. The occurrence of reservist and employer issues and difficulties continues to mount.

Civilian Employer Support Options

Efforts to identify and eliminate reservist/employer issues and controversy are documented almost daily in U.S. Army, DoD and civilian publications (GAO, 2002). Maintaining recruitment and retention initiatives is essential for the viability of the operational reserve. At the top of the initiative list is developing a strategy that will maintain the operational reserve force for the long-term. Support to the civilian employer is as important as recruitment and retention. Temporary monetary incentives to recruit

and retain reservists are one option for providing a short-term solution that is clearly good for reservists (Army, 2007). However, these incentives for reservists do not address the concerns of civilian employers and do little to maintain long-term support from reservist's families. Some civilian employer support options that have not been applied and which remain viable are: 1) continued legislation for employer support, 2) increased financial assistance, 3) improved reserve commander flexibility, 4) employer education support payment options, 5) temporary personnel replacement, 6) select reserve option, and 7) the teen-citizen support plan. Each of these seven options is analyzed in detail in the following subsections.

Continued Legislation for Employer Support

Local and state employers and governments desiring federal grant monies can be better leveraged to support the reserves. Legislation and benefits that support employers will only serve to strengthen the operational reserve and national security. Predictability of unit rotations is virtually no benefit to the civilian employer. A simple and effective government program to support the civilian employer, through the use of federal grants and funding allocation, during the reservist's absence would be helpful. Other forms of employer support may also be required. Such a program is implemented with the belief that employers understand both their role and the role of reservists in maintaining national security. One support option may not be sufficient by itself to maintain the high level of employer support required to maintain the operational reserve. Employers are aware of the skills reservists develop by maintaining their dual-status. Improving support to civilian employers can strengthen their commitment to reservists and their families.

Increased Financial Assistance

Another option is to establish policy that allows the employer to claim financial assistance to cover the associated costs of replacing an employee who has been mobilized. The reimbursable costs can include the hiring of a temporary replacement at an approximate reimbursed amount and other associated costs. The additional costs may include overtime if the employer uses other employees to cover the work of the reservist or any costs of hiring temporary replacement employees that exceed the reservist's civilian earnings. Financial assistance provided to employers will replace financial loss incurred as a result of employing and supporting an operational reservist (Military, 2008). Financial assistance in the form of tax incentives may help maintain employer support.

Improved Reserve Commander Flexibility

Allowing reserve component commanders increased flexibility in the scheduling and length of unit training assemblies (UTA), also known as monthly drills, will provide increased civilian employer support (Hall, 2007). The potential for some months during the year to remain without required UTA attendance will reduce the burden on civilian employers and improve their support to reservists. This fluid scheduling may require longer training periods during some months to retain some drill free months. This change can help maximize reserve support to employers during months when reservists are most needed at their civilian employment. One example is the reservist who is a civilian police or emergency medical service (EMS) employee. Civilian employment of these types is routinely busier and more volatile during summer months requiring increased employee work attendance. Other employee absence is also higher during summer months due to vacations and other absences. Seasonal employers (roofing or general laborers) who

might otherwise suffer employee/reservist loss will regain the employee during busy months. During the down or reduced-business-season, unit training assembly (UTA) scheduling may be increased thus offsetting the lack of employer work. This flexibility can provide a source of income for reservists during reduced business or layoff periods.

To accomplish this change, reserve commanders from company level and higher will require increased control over training scheduling that take place remote from battalion or higher headquarters and possibly on different dates and at different times. Encouraging integrated, joint training activities between reserve units and civilian agencies and organizations will increase civilian employer support, unit readiness and national security.

The constantly changing operational environment identifies issues relating to the reserves. Reservist/employer issues structure the reference material used in this thesis. This thesis initiates the effort to attract, retain and sustain a quality all-volunteer reserve force (soldiers, army civilians, and family members). Public trust and confidence gained and maintained will instill active support for the total army. Congressional and public support for resourcing the full cost of an expeditionary army is critical. A well-informed community of soldiers, army civilians, family members, and civilian employers is crucial to transformation success (Army Strategic, 2007).

A Military.com study, by the Associated Press, dated November 5, 2007, reveals disconnects between civilian employers and reservists transitioning back and forth from military service to the civilian workforce (Military, 2007). The transition for a reservist from and back into the civilian workforce has become increasingly difficult. Allowing the reservists' commanders increased flexibility in assigning training dates can result in

better support to the employer. However, maintaining a high level of reserve readiness may be more difficult because of fragmented and largely unorganized training periods.

Employer Education Support Payment Options

An employer support payment plan that provides Government payment or reimbursement for schooling and training supports both the reserve and civilian employer. Schooling or training for reservist employees improves productivity and job performance for the employer. With government support for this schooling and/or training, employees/reservists gain formal qualifications at no cost to their civilian employers. The training or schooling can be provided by the military, local, state, federal or accredited civilian institutions at no cost to the civilian employer or the reservist. Reservists develop desired credentials and personal skills that are attractive to civilian employers. The military retains highly trained, proficient and motivated reservists. Society as a whole seeks membership in the reserves, which would ease recruiting and retention issues. Civilian employers increase employment and retention of reservists for three reasons: there is no cost to the employer associated with employing a reservist, the employee-related education and training is paid for by the Government and the employer receives a better trained employee. The end result is a cost-effective form of supported, community-based reserve and national defense.

With this schooling/training option, reservists remain educated, trained and prepared to assist the community during times of natural disasters. In addition, the financial support provided by the employer support payment option can help all civilian employers, especially a small business employer or self employed reservist, to attract and hold employees in a very competitive market. Further, the program can assist the

employer to become an employer of choice by supporting the reservist and encouraging training, learning new skills, and remaining in good standing in the reserves. In this plan reservists can be placed on orders for all civilian employer desired schools and training. Similar to forming budgets, civilian employers would be required to submit projected schooling and desired training lists for their reservist prior to the next military fiscal year. The only obligation to the civilian employer is to allow and support the reservists' absence when called to duty. During long-term deployment the civilian employer is funded for the costs associated with temporarily replacing the reservist (Australia, 2008).

A dedicated government agency or independent civilian contractor may assume the role of program information dissemination, employer and reservist training on the program, and claim processing. The initial training is at no cost to the civilian employer. This program has the potential to slowly eliminate the use of enormous military bonuses. Limited retention and recruitment programs focused toward employers will retain the reserves and support the civilian employer. By shifting funds to a policy that better supports the civilian employer national security is achieved.

Temporary Personnel Replacement

The provision of temporary replacement personnel to the civilian employer is a viable solution to the absence of reservists from the workplace. The Government can sponsor a program for part-time employment. The nature of the employment will be for either a part-time or full-time employee. The temporary hire will serve as a replacement for the reservist who is called to active duty for any period of time. The civilian part-time employee can be of any age but must meet the requirements of the part-time position being filled. The replacement also must meet standards set and controlled by the

Government or agency with responsibility for the program such as the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve. In this plan the civilian employer would receive the replacement employee and incur no expense for wages or additional benefits; this would be covered by the United States government. Upon return of the reservist, the temporary hire would be released from the temporary position.

People in the United States have the luxury of sometimes retiring at a relatively early age (40–65) from their civilian or military employment. Those people that do “retire early” generally cannot sustain their standards of living at the reduced retirement rate and therefore seek a second part-time job or potential profession to make up the difference in pay to offset their reduced retirement pay. This pool of the civilian and military workforce can serve as the already trained and necessary part-time assets required to support this Temporary Operational Reserve Employee Replacement Program (TORERP). The Government will be the driving force behind such a program and establish the part-time replacement wages paid (easiest just to pay what the reservist/employee would have received) and possibly some other incentives such as a reduced retirement plan for ten and twenty years of part-time service to the nation in this civilian part-time program. An alternative would be to provide family healthcare benefits. The payment of mileage to and from the employee’s home to the worksite and possibly other small perks could be offered to entice the best, and most motivated part-time, early retirees.

This part-time/full-time temporary operational reserve employee replacement program would also draw from other elements of the civilian sector such as college-level cooperative education students (available from most universities), seeking part-time

employment or paid work experience with some added benefits and incentives. Again, the part time employee will have to meet the minimum requirements for the particular employer to accept the part-time employee. The Reserve Component forces and their respective civilian employers are diversified throughout the entire United States. The pool of part-time replacements will therefore have to be broken down by similar geographical locations in relation to the population of reservists assigned in their region. There are always educated, experienced and young retired people that are eager and capable of learning (if not already trained) for part-time positions (Census, 2001).

The use of reservists who seemingly go from one deployment to another indefinitely to fill temporary civilian positions vacated by mobilized reservists is another option. This pool of reservists usually remains unemployed when not engaged in some sort of ordered active duty. Often times these reservists welcome the opportunity to obtain valuable civilian work experience that they may benefit from in the future.

Daily articles are observed in newspapers revealing continuous layoffs from the civilian workforce. “General Motors to lay off 767 workers” (*Buffalo News*, 2007), and similar newspaper articles are commonplace to readers. Continued daily research on the application of civilians that are laid off from their regular civilian employment to a temporary Reserve replacement program that will support the Reservist’s civilian employer continues to grow more feasible. The January 11, 2008 business section of the *Buffalo Newspaper* stated “Auto workers face layoffs—East Syracuse, NY, 1,650 workers at the suburban Syracuse plant will be laid off over the next several weeks.” The end of the handbill given to the workers being laid off read, "WE ARE SIMPLY FIGHTING FOR OUR SURVIVAL!" January 16, 2008, *Buffalo News*, again.....650

Bank of America workers laid off, already cut 500 positions in 2007, and its part of a 3,000 job company-wide cut back. Applied Materials Company, a major supplier of computer chip-making equipment, is cutting 1,000 jobs (7%). Applied Materials laid off 1,750 employees in November of 2002.

Several civilian employers with knowledge of difficulties facing civilian employers of reservists believe that a government subsidized program designed to put the laid-off employees to work and simultaneously supporting civilian employers of deployed reservists simply makes sense. These reductions in the public sector workforce increase the selection of available working class citizens that could potentially fill positions temporarily vacated by the mobilized reservists. The part-time or temporary full-time employee pool will be overwhelming when advertisement methods are established. The fact that the civilian unemployed or retired workforce is supporting the reservist and the United States in a time of protracted conflict will insure that dependable and dedicated temporary employees are provided as relief to the civilian workforce at all levels and in all employment areas. If a program such as this is administered in conjunction with other NCESGR initiatives (employer certificate program) backed by the Government, civilian employers will benefit and continue to support the operational Reserve Component forces of the future. When the reservist employee returns from active military service, the temporary replacement will be released from the employment. As recurring reservist activations take place, the temporary replacement may seek reemployment to fill the temporary vacancy.

This type of program will provide the civilian workforce the reassurance that they cannot go wrong by supporting reservists. Adoption of the temporary operational reserve

employee replacement program will also serve to benefit the general population of unemployed people in the United States. The Government will automatically have the DOL pool of unemployed people to draw from in filling temporary vacancies created by activated reservists. Program registration will be mandatory for the unemployed who are seeking unemployment benefits. Signing up for this program will be mandatory if capable civilians/retirees wish to be considered for their states unemployment benefits.

This requirement will better identify the part of the population that is sincere about seeking employment and those that are not and merely unemployed for ease of government benefits. Ultimately each state will see a reduction in the number of unemployed and a reduction in unemployment benefits paid out. Some state governments, i.e., New York, have in the recent past engaged in the practice of hiring back their retired employees for either part-time or full time employment doing the same or similar jobs from which they retired (New York State Police). With this method of hiring, the state maintains or even increases its manpower/workforce while at the same time reducing its costs (salary and retirement benefit packages).

The increased and more effective use of Inactive Ready Reserve (IRR) soldiers has the potential to alleviate strain on the civilian employer. Activating unemployed IRR Soldiers to fill temporary civilian jobs left by mobilized reservists can minimize civilian employer personnel loss. The chosen solution(s) that best support the civilian employer would have to be accepted by the civilian employer. A policy that adequately fills the civilian employer's manpower shortage with little or no cost incurred by the employer is important to help secure the civilian employer/operational force partnership.

Select Reserve Option

First, it might make sense to establish a formal category of “high-readiness” reserves who in return for greater financial benefits, better training and more opportunities to serve would agree to undergo additional mandatory training and deploy immediately if needed (NATO: Canada, 2). A similar program called Select Reserve Forces existed in the U.S. military in the past but the program was discontinued for reasons not analyzed in this study. The 2006 QDR Report states that DoD will “develop select reserve units that train more intensively and require shorter notice for deployment.” (2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Report, 77). The military services have already launched several pilot programs to expand the number and types of variable reserve participation at the unit level. More comprehensively, the DoD has restructured reservists’ deployment schedules, making only a selected group of them subject to mobilization during certain time periods. These units undergo concentrated training preparation in order to reduce the time required for mobilization and deployment. Unlike a traditional tiered-readiness system, however, the service rotation systems for both the active and reserve components anticipate that over time all military personnel will endure periods of high readiness.

This plan offers that in return for higher financial compensation and increased benefits, reservists agree to maintain exceptionally high readiness levels, typically by training more than the norm, and to commit to longer terms of service. Former active-duty service members (Department of National Defense, 2005) are particularly valuable in this role given their familiarity with their country’s most recent military doctrine and tactics. Even countries that have thus far resisted using a system of “tiered” or

“graduated” readiness for their active-duty forces have been willing to apply this concept to their Reserve units. Providing these new capabilities invariably raises the financial costs of the reserves at a time when most major military powers are cutting their defense budgets. National military establishments are reducing the size of both their active-duty and reserve components, but the cuts in the regular forces have typically been greater because reservists are believed to be more cost-effective (Congress, 2008).

As governments spend more on training, equipping, and compensating reservists, however, the cost differential between the active and the reserve components will decrease. A particularly expensive development has been the extension to reservists of health, education and other benefits traditionally offered exclusively to regular soldiers. With the roles of reserve and regular forces increasingly indistinguishable on the battlefield, it becomes ever harder, both morally and politically, to deny reservists perquisites enjoyed by active duty soldiers. Overcoming recruitment and retention problems among reservists has also become expensive. To fill the ranks, governments have had to employ more recruiters, fund additional advertising, and provide more generous salaries and other benefits (Reserve policy of Nations).

Governments also confront the increasingly expensive burden of sustaining employers’ support for the expanding obligations on their reserve employees. On the one hand, the growing time commitment demanded from reservists for training and deployments has made them anxious about potential damage to their civilian careers, especially in terms of job promotion and retention. At the same time, competitive pressures have led even strongly patriotic employers to complain about the costs of supporting their frequently absent reservist employees (Assistant Deputy Minister, 2002).

State and local governments have responded to these pressures by both strengthening (or in some cases introducing for the first time) legal employment protections for reservists and providing much greater monetary compensation and other benefits to employers.

Organizations regularly solicit employers' views about the country's reserve policies and identify solutions that might benefit employers, reservists and governments alike. DoD should also evaluate certain foreign reserve practices to ascertain if they might profitably be applied or suitably modified, to the U.S. Reserve Components. Any such application would need to take into account the differences in countries' military commitments, active/reserve force mix, human and financial resources, and other criteria including the different implicit "social compacts" underpinning the roles of each nation's citizen soldiers.

To evaluate the potential of these select reserve unit options, DoD should evaluate whether the increase in predictability and preparedness that could result from formally designating certain military personnel as "high-readiness" reservists would outweigh the corresponding monetary costs and the possible negative effects on other reservists, who now would be seen, even if not formally so labeled, as "low readiness" components. Now that the United States is adjusting the length of its reserve deployments, moreover, perhaps DoD planners should consider the practice of more frequently rotating reserve units in and out of combat theaters. Such a practice helps improve the effective use of reservists, but may prove impractical given the global extent of U.S. military deployments.

Teen-Citizen Support Plan

In addition, U.S. entities such as the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR), a DoD staff agency that has established a nationwide network of voluntary local support committees, might consider adopting certain elements of supporting reservists and employers in an employer-based outreach program to help sustain private sector support for reservists and facilitate resolution of employer-employee problems concerning employees' military obligations (Military Review, 2004, 49-52). Although DoD has abandoned plans to establish an insurance program designed to compensate reservists or employers who suffer losses from the mobilization of their reserve employees, subsidy programs that might provide insights for future U.S. Government endeavors should not be ruled out. Congress might also wish to develop new initiatives to bolster high school recruitment into the reserves.

Another option is providing citizens between the ages of 16 and 18 an opportunity to spend a day at a nearby public facility (often a military base) at the government's expense to learn about the military establishment, including opportunities to serve in the reserves. Only those who complete the program receive the documents they need to receive preference for enrollment in certain advanced public education institutions. Although DoD reserve recruiters have a broad range of techniques at their disposal, they might benefit from adopting a more extensive program designed to expose young Americans to career opportunities in the military and its reserve components. More generally, experience by other countries might help U.S. human resource managers as they attempt to apply the "continuum of service" concept to the U.S. military. This concept was advocated most prominently in the December 2002 "Review of Reserve

Component Contributions to National Defense” study, mandated by the 2001 QDR. The concept seeks to deemphasize the inflexible binary choices commonly available in the past (active/reserve; full-time/part-time; etc.).

Instead, the “continuum of service” concept attempts to offer military personnel expanded opportunities to move into, between, and within active and especially reserve duty categories with varying time commitments and other obligations in return for corresponding levels of benefits as their personal interests and circumstances evolve (McCarthy, 2004, 30-35). On the other hand, attempting an innovative citizen reserve structure would probably not prove useful given the lack of a conscription acceptance in the United States (Beaumont, 2001, 393). Furthermore, the United States already has a range of intermediary bodies (think tanks, military associations, etc.) that attempt to maintain a link between U.S. society and its armed forces. In any case, the ARNG already performs many of the representational and public education functions. Some of the above options that remain feasible and available for application to the United States Army Reserve Components and the employer may ease transformation to an operational force.

Employment Partnership Program

Launched in April 2008, the Employment Partnership is a program designed to foster formal relationships between the U.S. Army Reserve and private sector civilian employers (Employer, 2008). Establishment of the Employment Partnership Program is a base that offers interested civilian employers one option to ease burdens encountered by employing and retaining reservists. The program initiates the essential task of building partnerships between employers and the operational reserve component force. Without

solid partnerships in which both employers and reservists are supported, the operational reserve may dwindle and face added retention and recruitment struggles.

Soldiers in the reserves receive some of the best occupational education, training, and experience in the world. In many cases Soldier's vocational and professional training directly relates to their civilian occupations or professions. Businesses that choose to partner with the reserves will need to agree with the reserves on many issues such as acceptable training and experience equivalents for reservist - filled positions, annual refresher training and accreditation requirements, if any. Partnership building and job-linking is less difficult when filling part-time or full-time general laborer, tradesman, and non-professional status business positions. Professional, managerial, civil service, state, and federal positions routinely require more extensive training, experience, and certification, thereby making civilian job placement more complex.

Offering to establish partnerships that will benefit civilian employers and businesses is admirable. However, establishing a list of volunteer businesses and companies that are willing to commit to supporting and employing the nation's operational reserves for the long-term may be difficult for several reasons. First, the partnership program requires the business or company to volunteer to participate based on their interest and desire to do so. There is no requirement that employers participate or accept the partnership program. Employers will eventually learn that the operational reserve force takes reservists from civilian employment more often and for longer periods of time than when there was a strategic reserve structure. Employers given an option of participating in a partnership program or not may choose not to participate for a number of reasons. If employers are guaranteed that the reservist they hire will be physically

replaced or if employers are compensated to accommodate their loss when the reservist is called for military service, partnerships will grow. Employer inconvenience and the money they may lose by partnering with the reserves are considerations in determining if a business will inquire about the voluntary partnership program or not.

Second, the partnership program asks, offers, and opens the door for businesses to seek additional information on this program but there is no single enticement contained in the Army Reserve strategic communication documents that will make employers and businesses immediately call for additional information. The enticement needs to be easily observed in the advertised Army Reserve strategic communication and perceived as a win-win opportunity for the employer or business owner. The enticement must be something that the employer absolutely cannot pass up considering. In the absence of a more rigid, mandatory, government sponsored employer participation requirement that is backed by congressional legislation, the employer or business will need to see an easily recognizable benefit to their participation the Army Reserve partnership program.

The concept of a business and Army Reserve partnership program is an excellent approach to building relationships and smartly seeking ways to save employers money by providing highly trained and certified Army Reserve Soldiers. However, this program appears to apply only to Soldiers in the Army Reserve. The ARNG is also one of the “Army Reserve Components” and they too are citizen-soldiers who possess military skills and civilian employment. Broadening the outreach programs and strategy for building partnerships in support of the entire operational reserve component force (USAR and ARNG) will better support all employers and businesses that may be interested in participating.

The employer partnership program does not currently address the many current civilian employers that presently employ reservists. Many of these employers and businesses have employed and retained reservists for many years. Some of these employers continue to serve, sacrifice and accept monetary loss by employing reservists. Partnership agreements entered into by the Inova Healthcare System and the American Trucking Associations (ATA) with the Army Reserve should be immediately leveraged to further promote and network the Employer Partnership Program (Employer, 2008). In addition to the current methods of growing this program, promotion and networking by reservists who are well-trained and well-informed should be included to generate maximum participation by employers. Simultaneously, reservists must be able to educate employers on expectations of employers and reservists in today's operational force. This outreach may also include some aspects of the NCESGR.

Coordinating programs such as the Army Reserve partnership program with existing programs that companies or businesses are already involved in may ease program difficulties and streamline efforts and funding while avoiding duplication of effort. For instance, in September 2004 the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) announced an additional \$21 million grant, available for use beginning March 2005, for the American Trucking Association's (ATA) Highway Watch Program (DHS, 2004). Partnering the Highway Watch Program with the Army Reserve Partnership would enhance partnerships, streamline funding, employ reservists and promote national security.

The Army Reserve should consider partnering with programs such as Recruit Military, a veteran military-to-civilian recruiting firm, founded in 1998 as a search firm

specializing in connecting Corporate America with transitioning junior military officers. The firm currently consists of many programs. They recruit and provide services to all individuals who have military backgrounds - men and women of all ranks and rates, veterans as well as transitioning military, members of the National Guard and reserve forces, and military spouses. Sharing already - established information databases will enhance the Army Reserve partnership program and better serve today's veterans, employers, and the operational reserve components (Recruit, 2003). Also, participating in existing grants, programs and partnerships that businesses receive or are involved in would significantly increase Army Reserve partnership abilities.

The U.S. Army Reserve Employment Partnership Program has great merit and can solve many of the problems that civilian employers have when reservists are mobilized. However, expansion of this program along with added military benefits appears to be desirable. A large number of warrior citizens maintain public sector civilian employment. Police departments, fire departments, corrections, and emergency medical services draw employees that are in the reserves or have a military background. These specialists are greatly needed in the reserves as well. Expanding the employer partnership program to public sector employers will help support employers (USAR, 2008). Employers can add to the benefits afforded by USERRA but employers cannot detract from the benefits (USERRA, 1994). A program that allows the public sector employer (city or municipality) to afford its departments (police, fire, public works, etc...) the added benefit of filling reserve employee vacancies from a list of certified retired (first) and then active (off duty) employees as temporary replacements will ease the employers loss, especially those who are bound by manning restrictions.

Reimbursing (through pay or tax incentives) employers for the replacement labor costs will constitute an “added military benefit” that will improve their support to the operational reserve and encourage employees to join and remain in the reserves.

Employers who adopt the “added military benefit” will save money by employing certified, trained, and experienced employees from within or who retired from their own businesses, departments or organizations. The employer will not incur any additional expense by having to provide training or benefits because the retirees and active employees will already have those skills and entitlements. The temporary hire will only receive an agreed - upon wage for their period of employment. Union agreements and other contracts that sometimes forbid hiring of part-time employees will have no argument since the program is a USAR and ARNG sponsored, city or municipality accepted, and added benefit afforded to departments in support of and provided to the operational reserve component forces. All federal, state, and local municipalities as employers along with the operational reserves will benefit from such an expanded operational reserve partnership program. Expanding the employer partnership program will increase the operational reserve component reach to a broader array of civilian businesses and employers, many of whom employ reservists.

Finally, further expansion of the Army Reserve partnership concept to include developing partnership programs with federal, state and local leaders should be considered. Building these partnerships will set the example for all local and regional businesses to follow while enhancing reservist employability. A brokered partnership among leaders that establishes operational reserve veterans preference points (at least ten points), for a one time use on initial employment federal, state or local civil service

exams or promotional exams will expand the already existing program, applied in many states and organizations, that allows either five or ten preference points for qualified veterans seeking employment or promotion within their current civilian occupations. Partnerships of all types will enhance civilian desire to join and remain in the operational reserve. Establishing many diverse partnerships that build on each other would be a great help in maintaining the highest quality Army Reserve.

Summary of Analysis Results

Many employer support options that would better support the civilian employer and the operational reserve component force are identified and analyzed in this Chapter Four. Consistent within each of the support options is continued need to provide better and more effective support to employers. If achieved, adequate support provided to the employer will foster greater acceptance of the operational reserve by employers, reservists and their families. Added improvement to current support programs for civilian employers will greatly reduce future reserve component manning issues. Failure to build and reinforce civilian employer commitment to national security through, by and with the reserves may compound concerns of maintaining an operational reserve component force in the future.

Initiation of employer partnership programs is very positive since they provide a springboard for support to reach all civilian employers. In addition, opportunity for public sector civilian employers to offer “added military benefits” to their reservists is established. Civilian employers reduce their loss while actively and honorably supporting the operational reserve. Pursuing partnership programs that create unity

between civilian employers and reservists in conjunction with other military programs will slowly erode difficulties associated with maintaining the operational reserve component force.

Any one, or a combination of the options identified and analyzed in this thesis may be sufficient to obtain full employer support of the reserve operational force. Options chosen must be solidly funded and adequately applied to support the estimated one-hundred and twenty thousand known unique civilian employers of Reserve Component members (ESGR, 2008, 7). On the other hand, if the support option application is weakly applied or insufficiently funded to employers, the desired support for the operational force will not be achieved. The primary role of the ESGR is to inform and educate civilian employers about their purpose in maintaining the operational reserve component force and national security (ESGR, 2008, 3). Showing civilian employers through solid employer support programs that they are a critical and essential part of national security will secure an endless line of reservists seeking dual-status success while bolstering employer and business capabilities. Conclusions and recommendations based on these analyses will be addressed in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Civilian employers sacrifice, primarily in loss of money, when their reservists are called away for military service. Employer loss of money occurs by loss of worker productivity while reservists are deployed, costs associated with filling the reservists position (regular and overtime payments), and long-term benefit payments. Unless a person with capabilities equal to those of the reservist taken from an employer fills their position, the employer suffers a loss when the citizen-soldier is mobilized. The issue of responsibility is a two way street. The reservist shares the burden with the civilian employer to maintain a quality military and civilian relationship that minimizes employee and employer disruption and inconvenience. Appropriate support from Congress can minimize the burdensome characteristics to both the reservists and their employers.

There are many programs in use and in development that address support to civilian employers and businesses. Congress and DoD understand the sacrifices required from and made by civilian employers to maintain both a reserve operational force and national security. The USAR Employment Partnership program places valued reservists that are already trained and experienced into equivalent civilian positions in the business sector. This placement saves civilian employers money and time that would otherwise be lost to training employees. Similar programs will be assessed and evaluated in the future.

The NCESGR with their over 4,400 volunteers continues to inform and educate reservists and employers on the many diverse issues and obligations associated with providing and maintaining an operational reserve component force. Although limited in

funding, the ESGR sponsors programs that recognize outstanding employer support. The ESGR scope of effort includes continued media relations, building business alliances, and direct outreach to all civilian employers that might employ reservists. All ESGR support activities remain of great value. The education programs and activities continue to move forward in-step with reserve component transformation. ESGR and other existing programs will continue to partner in support with new programs that support employers.

As partnerships are developed between reservists and businesses the replacement of professionals in certain key positions will be more difficult. Key position professionals are those employees that possess a level of knowledge or expertise that cannot be easily replaced. If these employees are essential to business operations to succeed, additional thought is required regarding their reserve duty status and obligations to both the reserves and their civilian employer. Placement of reservists in jobs and building partnerships with most entry - and mid - level occupations remain less difficult. A rule to follow in determining placement difficulty should include “the more technical and strategic the position, the more difficult the placement.”

From strictly a strategic transformation perspective, the focus of retaining the reserve component operational force of the future rests in the hands of not only the civilian employer but many other agencies and organizations as well. Reservists will continue to see a gap in responsibility for them and their civilian employers if a solid stand is not taken by responsible government agencies and Congress to directly address the issues involved. If not, reservist and employer questions, concerns and lack of clarity will persist. The National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (NCESGR) program will continue to remain questionable in its conclusive support and

mediation capabilities in support of the operational reserve component force and civilian employers. Responsibility for reservists and employers and their ability to support national security will remain in the hands of multiple agencies and organizations including the DoD (which encompasses the NCESGR), Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA), Department of Labor (DOL) encompassing the Division of Human Rights (DHR), and all other state and local government entities with their collective bargaining agreements.

Maintaining an operational reserve requires unity and support from all agencies and organizations. Each of these agencies/organizations will continue to interpret the congressionally accepted laws to their own benefit if not kept in check. Negative consequences to warrior-citizen and national security will remain in the shadows of policy and decision makers. A supported employer will allow those patriotic individuals who desire to serve their country to do so. This freedom and right should never have qualifiers placed on it.

With the transformation of the reserve component from a strategic reserve to an operational force comes an increase in obligation for all Americans, not just the reservist. Each year that the protracted conflict in Afghanistan and Iraq continues, the dedication, strength, and support provided to reservists and their civilian employers will remain more vital to national security. If the level of employer and reservist support declines, causing reservists to choose between service to the country or a civilian career, the potential dissolution of the operational reserve component force may result. In the absence of a reserve force Congress and the DoD will potentially face compounded issues regarding national security and conscription. The political, social, military, and economic

complications attached to not maintaining a reserve component force remain complex and unpopular for most people.

Retaining an operational reserve component force is possible. But retention will require new and innovative tactics, techniques, and procedures that focus on civilian employers and their support to the nation through the reservists. Establishing government sponsored civilian employer enhancing partnerships with every possible employer will support employers, reservists, their families and national security. Unity between employers and the operational reserve can be achieved over time. Combining partnerships with other identified employer support options and military benefits will further strengthen the Army.

A single U.S. Government level organization capable of providing reservist and civilian employer support systems and mechanisms that serve to bolster the economy will best serve the nation. U.S. Army Reserve Employer Partnership programs will do just that. The multiple, and sometimes redundant, support systems and organizations currently in place to serve the strategic reserve component force and their employers require transformation along with the reserve component force itself. Civilian employer and reserve programs individually cannot garner the high level of employer support that is required to maintain the operational reserve component force. Programs such as the Employer Partnership in concert with employer tax incentives, personnel replacement programs, monetary reimbursement programs or other government sponsored programs will achieve the support that is desired and deserved by employers of the nation's reserves.

Although the pre 9-11-2001 reserve and civilian employer support structure was successful at resolving reservist issues for a strategic reserve, it became obvious and increasingly more impractical to apply the same template to reservist and civilian employer issues with the advent of the transformation to an operational reserve component force. Increased use of and reliance on the reserve component force in the absence of adequate numbers of active duty military forces aggravates the problem. The operational reserve component force transformation coupled with a period of persistent conflict places the burden on everyone's shoulders. The reservists' and their employers' support to the new operational force remain contingent on the support they receive from Congress and all policy makers. In the absence of adequate tangible support, difficulties across the spectrum in support of the operational reserve component force are expected to become more serious over time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this research, it is recommended that one highly reliable agency or civilian contractor be established at the DoD level and be dedicated to and ultimately responsible for the application of all reserve component and civilian employer affairs. This structure will best support civilian employers, reservists, their families, and national security by eliminating the uncertainties and overlaps that currently exist. The inclusion of requirements and responsibility for all employers in the United States to accept and promote service in the reserves is essential to retaining a reserve component operational force. The operational reserve will continue to be essential during periods of protracted conflict and natural disasters, and methods to support employers must receive high priority.

If an employer, whether it be a civilian firm or a federal, state or local government, desires allocation of federal and state grants or funding, the opportunity should be leveraged against the entity based on their level of support provided to our nation's security and the operational reserve component force (reservist). Pursuit of civilian employer support alternatives is not limited to Congress and the reserve components. Corporations, businesses, and Chambers of Commerce all possess influence to steer improved support to employers who support the operational reserve. The increased need for support to civilian employers dictates that the voices of those impacted the most must be heard and reinforced.

Employer partnership programs will serve as a conduit for all other programs in support of the civilian employer. Whether there is only one employer support program in use or five, partnerships are critical to supporting the employer. The employer will remain essential in sustaining reservists, their families and the operational reserve component force. Focusing on building enduring partnerships while applying other employer support options is the best approach to maintaining the operational reserve components.

Several areas requiring further research are a survey of the nation's civilian employers that identifies shortfalls they face as a result of their reservists' increased and lengthier deployments. Another survey directed at the reservists is needed that identifies actual civilian employment difficulties they now face and will continue to experience as part of the operational force if issues are not addressed. A review of current information presented by all organizations (USAR, ESGR, and ARNG) to the civilian business community should be conducted to insure relevance to the operational reserve component

force. This communication is critical to shaping the partnership building capacity between the reserves and civilian employers. Finally, Congress and the military services should consider a detailed auditing of how much money they could save by re-thinking operational reserve recruitment and retention. By focusing resources and the information campaign on civilian employer support and reducing or potentially eliminating bonuses and temporary recruitment initiatives, reserve quotas will be filled more easily and employer support will grow in support of both the reserves and national security.

In conclusion, the actual, physical replacement of an employer's deployed reservists is desirable to accommodate the employer's loss. This show of good faith has the potential to encourage employers to support the reserves. Absent legislation that replaces the employer's reservists, a monetary or tax reimbursement plan applied in conjunction with other employer support options may adequately fill the void. It is also recommended that the Army Reserve Employer Partnership programs continue to be developed and implemented. Partnership programs identify the important role that civilian employers play in maintaining national security. The programs provide a variety of tangible support to employers as they continue to hire and retain reservists. The worst case scenario is for Congress not to act or address support options for civilian employers who employ the operational reserve component force.

REFERENCE LIST

- Army. (2005). Headquarters Department of the Army: *Field Manual 1*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 2-8 to 2-13.
- Army Strategic Communication Guide. (2007). *Army Reserve and Army National Guard Transformation, 2007*.
- Army Times. (2007). Civilian Employers and the Army Reserve, October 15, 2007, p. 14.
- Army Times. (2007). Returning Reservists Face Employment Difficulties, October 22, 2007, p. 22.
- Assistant Deputy Minister. (2002). Public Affairs, Department of National Defense, "Backgrounder: The Reserve Force and Reserve Classes of Service," www.forces.gc.ca/site/newsroom/view. (accessed October 17, 2007).
- Associated Press. (2007). Reservists Report Job Problems, November 8, 2007. www.military.com (accessed November 10, 2007).
- Australia's Defense Forces. (2008). www.defence.gov.au/reserves, *Employer Handbook*, (accessed March 8, 2008).
- Beaumont, John. (2001) Australian Defense: Sources and Statistics, Vol. VI, The Australian Centenary History of Defense, South Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 393.: (accessed October 17, 2007).
- Benko, Cathy, Weisberg, Anne. (2007). *Mass Career Customization: Aligning the Workplace with Today's Nontraditional Workforce*. Deloitte Development LCC. Harvard Business School Press.
- Buffalo News. (2007). Business Section, Buffalo. (accessed October 17, 2007).
- Census Bureau's Statistics of U.S. Businesses. (2001). www.census.gov/epcd/www/smallbus.html#empsize. (accessed November 4, 2007).
- Clinton, Hillary Rodham. (2004). Remarks delivered at the "*Transforming the Reserve Component for the 21st Century*" conference, Washington, D.C.
- Codified at 38 U.S.C. § 4301–4333 (2000), as most recently amended by the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004, Pub. L. 108-454, § 201-204, 118 Stat. 3606.
- Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. (2007). Second Report to Congress. March 1, 2007.

- Commission on the National Guard and Reserve s. (2008). Final Report to Congress. January 31, 2008.
- Congressional Budget Office, The Effects of Reserve Call-Ups on Civilian Employers (May, 2005).
- Congressional Budget Office, The Effects of Reserve Call-Ups on Civilian Employers (May, 2007).
- Davenport, Christian (2007). When Service Limits Options As Deployments Continue, Some Reservists Rejected for Jobs Washington Post, Washington, D.C.: (accessed October 24, 2007); Page A14.
- Defense Manpower Data Center, Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program. (2005). Reserve Component Members as First Responders/Emergency Services, Survey Note No. 2005-001, Arlington, Va.
- Department of National Defense. (2005). "Canadian Rangers," www.rangers.dnDCa/pubs/rangers/intro_e.asp: (accessed October 17, 2007).
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS). (2004). www.dhs.gov: (accessed April 8, 2008).
- Employer Partnership. (2008). U.S. Army Reserve. www.ArmyReserve.Army.mil: (accessed May 16, 2008).
- ESGR, (2007). Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve," Information for Employers," <http://www.esgr.org/employers.html>: (accessed September 22, 2007).
- ESGR, (2008). Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve, Air National Guard, Business and Industry Conference, Briefing, May 8, 2008.
- Foresman Jr., Henry J. (2007). *ARMED FORCES JOURNAL - Culture battle. - August 2007* Armed Forces Journal, 8 AUG 2007.
- GAO-06-745. (2006). Force Structure: Army Needs to Provide DOD and Congress More Visibility Regarding Modular Force Capabilities and Implementation Plans. Washington, D.C.: (accessed October 4, 2007).
- GAO-06-962. (2006). Force Structure: DOD Needs to Integrate Data into Its Force Identification Process and Examine Options to Meet Requirements for High-Demand Support Forces. Washington, D.C.: (accessed October 4, 2007).
- GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE WASHINGTON DC, & Schuster, C. (2002). RESERVE FORCES: DOD actions needed to better manage relations between Reservists and their employers.

- General Information Bulletin. (1990). No. 90-09: Military Leave with Pay (Section 242, New York State Military Law). Under, §242 of the New York State Military Law, www.cs.state.ny.us, (accessed September 24, 2007).
- Gordon, S. (2007). *Reserve Forces Almanac*. Washington, D.C.: Uniformed Services Almanac.
- Great Britain. (2005). The Reserve Forces (Call-out and Recall) (Financial Assistance) Regulations 2005, Statutory Instrument No. 859 of 2005 (SI 2005/859), www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2005/20050859.htm, (accessed October 20, 2007).
- Guard & Reserve Handbook. (2007). Military Times Media Group, Army Times, 20 August 2007, p46-49.
- Hall, Thomas F. Hon., Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, (2007). *The Officer*, Reserve Officers Association, December 2007.
- Hart, Gary. (1998). *The Minuteman, Restoring an Army of the People*. New York, NY: The Free Press
- Heller, Charles. (1992). *ECONOMY OF FORCE: A TOTAL ARMY, THE ISRAEL DEFENSE FORCE MODEL*. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute U.S. Army War College.
- Heller, Charles. (1993). *TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY FORCE: A FEDERAL ARMY AND A MILITIA*. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute U.S. Army War College.
- Hemphill, T. A. (2004). *Corporate Citizenship and the Employee/Citizen Soldier*. Business horizons, 47(2), 3.
- Herron, Sean. (2004). *Twice the Citizen: The New Challenges of Serving in the Army Reserve and National Guard*. Bloomington, Indiana: Author House.
- Jacobs, Jeffrey A. (1994). *The Future of the Citizen-Soldier Force*. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Janofsky, Michael, and Adam Nagourney. (2005). "Governors Concerned Over National Guard Deployments in Iraq," New York Times.
- Lewison, J. (2004). Military call-up prompts focus on USERRA. Journal of Accountancy, 197(1), 76.
- McCarthy, Dennis M. (2004). "The Continuum of Reserve Service," *Joint Forces Quarterly*, No. 36, December 2004, pp. 30-35.: (accessed October 17, 2007).
- Military.com. (2007). www.military.com, (accessed November 6, 2007).

- Military Review. (2004). *The National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve* May-June 2004 pp. 49-52.: www.esgr.org.: (accessed October 17, 2007).
- NATO National Reserve Forces Committee “National Reserve Forces Status: Canada,” p.2. (accessed October 17, 2007).
- Quadrennial Defense Review Report, (2007). p. 77.
- RAND CORP SANTA MONICA CA, Grissmer, D. W., Kirby, S. N., & Sze, M. (1992). Factors affecting reenlistment of Reservists: Spouse and employer attitudes and perceived unit environment.
- Recruit Military, (2003). www.recruitmilitary.com. (accessed May 18, 2008).
- Rosseau, S., & Newman, B. (2006). Military leave rules for employers issued. *Benefits Law Journal*, 19(2), 32.
- Schultz, Lieutenant General Roger C. (2001). “*First Rate Soldiers Serving the Nation*” Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army.
- Stultz, Jack C. Jr. LTG, Chief, Army Reserve . (2007), *2007 Veterans Day Message*. (accessed November 10, 2007).
- Stultz, Jack C. Jr. LTG, Chief, Army Reserve . (2007), Vol. 57, No. 10 issue. *ARMY MAGAZINE: ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY*. p146
- The Buffalo News. (2007). *Business Today*, Monday November 12, 2007. D7.
- The data on Reservists’ employment derive from CBO’s analysis of Department of Defense, Defense Manpower Data Center, May 2004 Status of Forces Survey of Reserve s (CD-ROM release of data, February 2005).
- Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers*. 7th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- USAR. (2008). *U.S. Army Reserve Employer Partnerships*, Presentation to Charleston Area Medical Center, Charleston, WV, May 20, 2008.
- U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. ST 20-10, *Master of Military Art and Science (MMAS) Research and Thesis*. Ft. Leavenworth, KS: USA CGSC, August 2007.
- U.S. Department of the Army, Army Leadership, *Field Manual 22-100*. (1999). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army.

USERRA. (1994). *Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 § 1002.3*. (accessed November 3, 2007).

United States Joint Forces Command, (2004). *The Joint Warfighting Center Joint Doctrine Series, Pamphlet 4: Doctrinal Implications of Operational Net Assessment (ONA)*. Norfolk, VA.

United States Office of the Assistant Secretary of defense (Reserve Affairs). (2000). *The Reserve Components of the United States Armed Forces*, (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, December 2000), i.

Weigley, Russel F. (1967). *History of the United States Army*. New York: the MacMillan Company.

Weitz, Richard, Dr. (September 2007). *THE RESERVE POLICIES OF NATIONS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS*. <http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/>. Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, PA. (accessed October 13, 2007).

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

Combined Arms Research Library
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
250 Gibbon Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2314

Defense Technical Information Center/OCA
825 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite 944
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

Dr. Ralph O. Doughty
Department of Transformation
USACGSC
100 Stimson Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301

LTC Prisco R. Hernandez
USANG LNO
USACGSC
100 Stimson Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301

Brigadier General William D.R. Waff
DCO 99th RRC
P.O. Box 1246
Coraopolis, PA 15701-6246

List all others you are going to provide copies of your thesis (provided your thesis is distribution A)