



CIVIL AIR PATROL INSPECTOR GENERAL IG AUDIENCE

Volume 12 Issue 2

April 2021

PLEASE FORWARD THIS TO ALL UNITS IN YOUR WING!



From Col Cheryl Fielitz-Scarborough, CAP/IG:

There have been many changes and clarifications as to how the IG Corps measures and determines compliance. The IG Corps works **independently and objectively** to determine compliance through both complaint resolution and compliance inspections accomplished at the wing and below wing levels. We encourage you to read through 20-1, 20-2, and 20-3 to ensure you are up to date with the latest in the IG world. Updated 20-2 was published 30 Nov and 20-1 and CAPP 40-20 are in the review stage to ensure compatibility with the new education and training programs.

Compliance Monitoring Dashboard (CMD) is being used heavily by commanders and inspectors in preparation for compliance inspections at the region, wing, and sub-unit levels. It is also a valuable tool for commanders to assess the compliance level within their wings. This dashboard is not intended to be all-inclusive. It monitors only items with data items tracked in e-Services.

The CMD will NOT include all aspects of the inspection tabs. It is impossible to have some of the tabs brought online due to the size and the composition of the information entailed. It *does* bring together a bulk of the items in one location which greatly reduces the prepping time required for an upcoming inspection.

When filing a complaint, be sure to read CAPR 20-2 and follow the procedures closely. It will assist you in understanding the process of complaint resolution. Remember, complaints should be dealt with at the lowest level possible. Since the new Complaint Resolution (CR) process is live, **CAPF 20's should be filed using the online system.** A NCRO from outside your wing or region will be assigned to ensure objectivity and will alleviate any perception of conflict of interest.

We have done a complete overhaul of the IG courses – working to get a majority of them online. These changes reflect the new TWO-option training where you can choose to study inspections or complaint resolution. And yes, eager beavers, you can do both if you chose. For those of you new IGs who need the IGC which will now be called the IG Master Course (IGMC), we are working on that as well. Col Ed Burns (IGT) will be posting more on this.

Reminder: Use the online CAPF 20 when filing a complaint; found on the CAP website under Inspector General. **All complaints are received at the NHQ/IG level.** It is easier and documents get into the hands of the NCRO much quicker than the use of the paper form. The paper form is still available for use as well.



The Answer to January's Practice Complaint *by Lt Col Preston Perrenot, CAP/IGQ*

This is the "answer" to the complaint analysis article from the January 2021 issue of the IG Audience. As you will recall, our original complaint went something like this:

The complainant saw a post on Facebook showing what she believed was hazing in progress. On 1 July, 2020, the XXWG Encampment was in progress at Army National Guard Base, Bradley. There was ARNG drill sergeant addressing the cadets as a guest speaker during breakfast. At one point, the guest speaker had the cadets do pushups in the chow hall. This occurrence lasted for approximately four minutes and Maj. John Doe, the wing Director of Cadet Programs, who was present, did not order it stopped. The event was video-taped and the video eventually made its way onto Facebook. The post does in fact, show the cadets doing pushup at the direction of a female U.S. Army NCO and the incident is described as a "demonstration."

I "peeled the onion" and found this single allegation against Maj. Doe:

ALLEGATION 3.1

Maj Doe violated CAPR 60-2; to-wit: Being in a position of authority at the encampment, allowed a U.S. Army National Guard drill sergeant to force cadets under Maj Doe's charge to do pushups, at XXWG Encampment, held at MCBH on 1 July 2020.

So, the "gut" reaction to this is, were they forced to do it or did they volunteer? Was this part of the program or spontaneous? Were the cadets being punished or not? My God, we need to go to investigation and ask a lot of people a lot of questions! Relax. And take some antacid for your gut. Remember, this the analysis stage and what we are doing is comparing the reported incident with the regulations. Before taking the "nuclear option," read the regulations.

REGULATION VIOLATED	NUMBER & PARAGRAPH
SERIOUS OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF CAP REGULATIONS, To Wit: HAZING	CAPR 35-3, para 4b(7)

ALLEGATION 3.1 ANALYSIS

Part 1: CAPR 60-2, para 1.5.4. defines Hazing as "any conduct whereby someone causes another person to suffer or to be exposed to any activity that is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. Questions of hazing often pertain to the intensity level of military-style training in Cadet Programs. Training intensity is evaluated in context. For example, a training intensity that is too stern and demanding for a unit meeting may be appropriate at an encampment."

Part 2: Maj. Doe did not prevent or stop a U.S. Army National Guard Non-Commissioned Officer from making CAP cadets to do push-ups

Part 3: CAPR 60-2 states: "An inappropriately high level of training intensity does not meet this regulation's definition of abuse or hazing unless it causes serious physical harm or serious emotional harm. Inappropriate yelling, using exercise as punishment, and creating an overly-stressful environment and other conduct listed in CAPP 60-15 are examples of inappropriately high training intensities that will be treated as boundary violations." Thus, push-ups are not a violation of the regulations. Push-ups as a punishment are a boundary violation but not hazing. Further, the complainant was not present and did not witness the event. She is basing her complaint solely on the video posted on the XXWG Facebook page of the cadets doing push-ups. She has provided no other independent evidence of hazing or abuse. The text accompanying this video clearly states that the army drill sergeant in question was a guest speaker at breakfast on 1 July and part of her presentation was a demonstration on how push-ups are done in the army. Since these push-ups were part of a demonstration and not administered as punishment, there is no boundary violation or violation of regulations.

If you go solely by CAPR 60-2, a glance at a photograph looks like hazing. But that same paragraph also speaks about “intensity level of military-style training.” Well, that “intensity level” is not described in the regulation so how do you know what it is? You are not limited to just regulations for research. Just about any CAP publication and database is open to you. In this case, your answer is in the pamphlets.

The take-away from this exercise is, for a little more research and reading, you found out that you don’t need to ask a lot of people a lot of questions because what is in that photograph does not violate the regulations, thus saving yourself a lot of work and everyone else a lot of heart burn.

Have You Heard?

- The revised CAPP 40-20, *IG Specialty Track* is planned to be released at the same time as the new CAPR 20-1. Delays have been experienced due to our needing to conform to the new specialty track program formats. We felt it wiser to take the time now rather than have to redo the pamphlet in the coming months.
- Remember that you can obtain Annual Refresher credit by successfully completing ALL four quizzes from *The Audience*! The credit is posted ***only after the fourth quiz is successfully completed.*** Other opportunities that are available to obtain credit during a calendar year are by:
 - Successfully completing any IG course in AXIS (automatically granted)
 - Attending an IG Summit at the wing/region/national level (sign in sheet must be forwarded to igt@capnhq.gov by Wing/Region IG)
 - Attending a learning lab at a national conference (Sign in sheet collected)
- Region/Wing IGs who may be looking for topics to present at their conferences should feel free in contacting igt@capnhq.gov . There are presentations sitting in the archives which have been used in the past and might just fit your needs without having to totally reinvent the wheel.
- Confusing as it may be, when we refer to LMS today we mean CAP’s ‘Learning Management System’ platform which is now called AXIS. Before AXIS, the platform and the product were both called LMS.
- Additional guidance for Wing IGs. If you have any currently open inspections where an E-1, Q1 discrepancy was written based on a duty position not being filled (not a duty assignment being administratively appointed incorrectly), the CAP/IGI agrees that you should go into the Discrepancy Tracking System and close the discrepancy without further action required by the unit commander.
- Two of our IGs took the time to share presentations they have made to their constituents. Perhaps others out there also have something to share with the rest of the IG community. Remember, education of your members is a required task for IGs. Take a look at these presentations at:
 - Inspection Preparation Guide (Lt Col William Collister, SDWG/IG):
https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/media/cms/SDWG_Inspection_Preparation_Guide_2_377E1C0AA5F78.pdf
 - SUI Preparation Guide (Col Linette Lahan, NCR/IG):
https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/media/cms/Prep_for_SUI_131F0D62CDD1C.ppt





A new section of the newsletter addressing questions submitted by our readers. This is why we ask you to complete a survey at the end of each quarter's quiz. If one person has a question, there must be others wondering why things occur the way they do.

1. Why must I complete the 4th Audience quiz by 31 Dec? Why can't it be extended to 31 Jan of the following year?

Answer: The AXIS system applies credit to your training record based upon the completion date. If you took the quiz after 31 Dec you would not get credit for the previous year.

2. A path for someone like myself with a Masters in IG from the late 90's to update their knowledge and skills and stay active through refreshers to be utilized in an SUI, IO, etc.

Answer: The IG program that existed in the 90's and earlier doesn't come close to the IG program in 2021. You can certainly remain current by retaking the Complaint Resolution and Inspection courses in AXIS. You can also complete all of the prerequisites and attend the IG Master Course if you so desire.

3. I think it would be beneficial to be able to appoint in eServices the Inspection Augmentees, as part of the track for movement through the IG Specialty track.

Answer: Under the new IG Specialty Track program you must be an Inspection Augmentee in order to progress through the Inspection path. It does not require you to be 'appointed' in eServices. The key is being IA-qualified.

4. Provide to the IGs all of the templates that they need to perform their duties when processes and requirements change.

Answer: The only 'templates' used in the IG program are those for Complaint Resolution. All NCROs/ANCROs/NRP Members are provided with current templates by the CAP/IGQ. The current worksheets for inspections are always available for both wing- and sub-unit level compliance inspections at:

- Wing-level: <https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/inspection-checklist>
- Sub-unit level: <https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/sui>

“I Don’t Have Time For This SUI Crap... I Have A Squadron To Run!”

By Col Gary J. Mayo, CAP, GLR/IG



How many times have you heard those words; expressed them yourself; or at the very least, had them go through your mind? Well, you are not alone! Every commander at every level of the organization has had the same thoughts about an upcoming inspection and if they tell you otherwise, they probably are not being truthful with themselves.

I have held command duty assignments from Squadron to Wing, as well as conduct both subordinate unit inspections and wing compliance inspections and I am here to tell you... ***I get it! inspections can be a royal pain in the arse (a Politically Correct Term).*** So, I am taking this opportunity to address the elephant in the room and put SUIs in perspective, whether you are a commander, staff officer, or inspection team member.

Why Are SUIs Even Necessary?

Well... I could be like a parent and give the short answer, *“Because I said so!”* (or in our case, because the regulations say so), but that does not answer the question so, what’s the real reason?

It all starts with the fact that Civil Air Patrol is tasked with significant responsibilities, all of which are directly tied to our three missions: Cadet Programs, Aerospace Education and Emergency Services. These missions are established in CAP’s Constitution and Bylaws and further reinforced in the Cooperative Agreement between Civil Air Patrol and United States Air Force. To fulfill these purposes, CAP is authorized to use equipment, supplies, and other resources provided to CAP by the Federal Government or acquired by CAP with appropriated funds. In Fiscal Year 2020 for example, CAP received over \$50 million in Federal Funding, \$39.1 million of which was designated for operations and maintenance. That translates into the need for total accountability, and accountable we are, with extensive mandatory annual performance reporting being provided to the Federal Government. For this reason, understanding what is taking place at the local unit level from how funds are being utilized, to the operational readiness of aircraft, equipment, and personnel is essential. You may think of yourself as *“just a local unit”*, but your importance in the bigger picture is more that you may realize, which is where inspections come into play.

The Cooperative Agreement between Civil Air Patrol and United States Air Force mandates that CAP and CAP-USAF will jointly establish and maintain both a region- and wing-level compliance inspection program that assesses the CAP wing’s ability to comply with mission critical requirements. The Agreement also states that CAP will establish and maintain an inspection system for CAP units below the wing level. The result of this is that we inspect units below wing level to ensure compliance with CAP regulations; publish inspection reports; and then hold units accountable to respond and resolve discrepancies in a timely manner.

So at the end of the day, while it may come down to, *“because we said so”*, there is a very good and logical reason why the Subordinate Unit Compliance Inspection program is in place. I understand however, that does not make it any less of a P.I.A., so let me address the opportunity an SUI presents for commanders and their staff.

Treat the SUI as a Learning Opportunity

Let’s face it, far too many units wait until they receive the 60-day notification of an upcoming inspection and then shift into *“oh crap panic mode”*, and scramble to ensure they are in compliance. Then, they scramble even more when the staff discovers during the review they are not. (Sound familiar?)

Commanders and their staffs have a tremendous opportunity to use the SUI process as a learning experience, both ongoing, and on-the-spot. Think about it from this perspective:

- The SUI is used to confirm that the minimum OPR mandated requirements are being met in a section or area of responsibility. The SUI Worksheets are like an open book test with the answers provided. We tell you what is going to be inspected; how compliance will be verified; and which regulation (down to the paragraph number) is the basis of the inspection question.
- Most inspection items have to be accomplished on an ongoing year-round basis and not during a 60-day pre-inspection scramble. Each staff duty assignment has specific roles and responsibilities which are guided by CAP regulations. As staff members are performing their jobs, use the worksheets throughout the year to ensure the key inspection items are being addressed. Do not consider these items to be the only things that need to be done, but rather the key items in the overall area of responsibility that should be accomplished on an ongoing basis. The worksheets along with other tools can also assist a person who may be new in a duty assignment in understanding their job responsibilities.
- Inspectors can provide on-the-spot learning opportunities. Inspection team members generally have extensive experience in the areas they are inspecting; many will have a master rating. They are not just there to ask questions; they can also answer questions and provide guidance and tips. Many can also share better practices or meaningful observations from prior unit inspections. They are a source of knowledge for unit staff during the inspection process.
- There is nothing in the inspection rule book that says a section inspection is closed door. While the inspection discussion may be focused on one or two section leaders, there is no reason why other staff can't sit in, listen to the discussion, and learn. The caveat being that the commander is comfortable with this learning opportunity for the staff, and the observers are not disruptive during the inspector's interview.

AOT² (A-O-T Squared)

A-O-T Squared is short-hand for the **Attitude of the Top = Attitude of the Team**. Said another way, the attitude of the Commander will cascade down through the staff and be reflected in their attitudes as well. Whether intentional or not, whether clearly demonstrated or not, if the Commander views an inspection as a major inconvenience and complete waste of their time, that attitude will be reflected by the staff as well.

A Word on SUI Inspection Cycles & Discrepancies

Inspection Cycles -- Units below wing-level are required to be inspected every 24 months. The regulations allow units to be inspected up to the 27th month before suspension of activity, **HOWEVER**, make no mistake about it... if a unit exceeds the 24th month, it is out of compliance. Commanders should be working with their Wing Inspector General to schedule an inspection as close to the 24-month cycle as possible. Please do not think if the IG is slow in scheduling a unit's inspection, that it is his/her problem. It's actually the commander's problem for two reasons: 1) IAW CAPR 20-3, the inspection program is the Commander's program (the IG is the administrator of the inspection process); 2) The IG is not the one facing a potential suspension of activity at the 27th month. So, stay on your IG and request an inspection if you are at 24 months and haven't been contacted with a scheduled timing.

Discrepancies – Discrepancies will occasionally happen, although given my comments above I hope more units nationally get to “Zero D”, a term we coined when I was Michigan Wing IG which stands for “Zero Discrepancies.” My advice is for unit staff to work on closing discrepancies within 30-45 days of the inspection. The Inspection Knowledgebase provides clear guidance on what is required, and most discrepancies can be quickly addressed and closed. So, get them done and closed as soon as possible and move on.

A Final Thought

Inspections represent an important and valuable check and balance in our system of doing things within CAP. There is a logical regulatory reason for having them, but there is also a great learning experience if you choose

to take advantage of the opportunity and not view it as a necessary evil and just another box to check. Take inspections seriously, embrace the process, and get the most out of it.



Virtual Inspections

By Lt Col Craig Gallagher, CAP/IGI

Subordinate Unit Compliance Inspections:

As we appear to be coming out from under the lock downs across the country, we may want to weigh our options for doing in-person versus virtual inspections. We have several items we consider EOHO (Eyes-On-Hands-On) that we have traditionally inspected in person, like Supply and Transportation. Before the pandemic we had occasional circumstances (closed roads, non-flying weather, etc.) that required us to inspect remotely by using Zoom, GoToMeeting, Microsoft Teams, or just photographs the inspector requested. The remote inspections never had the warm, fuzzy feel that you really saw

everything in its real setting.

The other critical item with remote inspections, you miss out getting to meet and talk with fellow CAP members, see their squadron headquarters, and watch how they function. Interviewing and discussing the inspection is very important in determining how commanders feel about having their unit inspected.

Wing/Region Compliance Inspections:

For the past year, we have been doing remote compliance inspection for wing and for the first-time regions! The CI Team has traditionally completed a large portion of the inspection before ever arriving onsite. Areas like Aerospace Education, most of Cadet Programs, Mission Management, Flight Management, Professional Development, most of Administration, Public Affairs, Information Technology, Safety and Inspector General can be completed with just information found in eServices or with key data being supplied by the director of that area.

The other areas: Communications, Aircraft Management, Supply and Transportation require EOHO. It turns out the remote inspection is not as good for the wing/region as the in-person. We have come across numerous cases where discrepancies were written up but wouldn't have been if we had been onsite.

Inspectors do more than just go through the worksheet checklists; they also see things that are worth discussing with the directors and/or the commander.

By the time you read this we will be doing our first in-person compliance inspection in 14 months and I have very high expectations that it will turn out well.

Thanks for being a member of our Inspection Teams and remember... "Semper Gumby!"

Revisiting Cycle 5 Wing-Level Discrepancies

By Col Steve Miller, CAP/IGIA



Per CAPR 20-3 para 5.1 “The CAP/IG and CAP-USAF/IG will conduct joint wing-level compliance inspections. The agreed upon frequency is approximately every 48 months.”

Due to holidays, NHQ events, pandemics, etc. that timeframe may vary slightly. A wing’s CI may be scheduled before or slightly after 48 months.

We have 52 wings and 8 regions. The IG staff usually completes 15 inspections each year. Completing all 52 wing- and 8 region-level CIs is considered one cycle. We are in our 20th year of performing wing-level CIs and the 2nd year of performing region-level CIs. We began the 6th cycle in January 2021. Following each Wing/Region-level

Compliance Inspection, data from the reports is summarized and analyzed. At the end of the inspection cycle this data is provided to CAP and CAP-USAF staff for further analysis.

This is the first year the data has been presented this way. Feedback on the data has been positive and we will continue to make this information available. More on this subject will be presented in the next edition of The Audience. The analysis of Cycle 5 data has been completed and is summarized below:

Grades by Tab			
Tab	# of Highly Effective	# of Effective	# of Ineffective
A-1 Aerospace Education	1	45	6
B-1 Cadet Programs	0	48	4
C-1 Mission Management	0	52	0
C-2 Communications	0	44	8
C-3 Flight Management	0	52	0
C-4 Aircraft Management	0	44	8
D-1 Professional Development	0	51	1
D-4 Administration	0	46	6
D-5 Personnel	0	52	0
D-6 Public Affairs	0	48	4
D-7 Supply	0	49	3
D-8 Transportation	0	52	0
D-9 Information Technology	0	50	2
E-1 Commander	0	51	1
E-2 Safety	0	47	5
E-3 Inspector General	0	48	4

Tabs Graded Ineffective	
Tab	#
C-2 Communications	8
C-4 Aircraft Management	8
A-1 Aerospace Education	6
D-4 Administration	6
E-2 Safety	5
B-1 Cadet Programs	4
D-6 Public Affairs	4
E-3 Inspector General	4
D-7 Supply	3
D-9 Information Technology	2
D-1 Professional Dev	1
E-1 Commander	1
C-1 Mission Management	0
C-3 Flight Management	0
D-5 Personnel	0
D-8 Transportation	0

Discrepancies by Tab	# of Disc
C-4 Aircraft Management	130
D-4 Administration	124
E-3 Inspector General	119
D-7 Supply	93
C-2 Communications	78
C-1 Mission Management	67
E-1 Commander	53
B-1 Cadet Programs	47
C-3 Flight Management	38
D-8 Transportation	35
D-9 Information Technology	35
D-6 Public Affairs	32
E-2 Safety	30
A-1 Aerospace Education	22
D-1 Professional Dev	17
D-5 Personnel	12
Total # of Discrepancies	932

Tabs Sorted by REPEAT Discrepancies			
Tab	# of DISC	# Repeat Disc	Total Disc
E-3 Inspector General	100	19	119
D-7 Supply	78	15	93
C-4 Aircraft Management	116	14	130
C-1 Mission Management	59	8	67
C-2 Communications	70	8	78
E-1 Commander	45	8	53
D-4 Administration	117	7	124
D-6 Public Affairs	26	6	32
D-8 Transportation	29	6	35
C-3 Flight Management	34	4	38
A-1 Aerospace Education	20	2	22
B-1 Cadet Programs	45	2	47
D-1 Professional Development	16	1	17
D-5 Personnel	11	1	12
E-2 Safety	29	1	30
D-9 Information Technology	35	0	35
DISCREPANCIES	830	102	932

Top 10 Discrepancies - CYCLE 5 - Ranked by Occurrence

Tab	Ques #	Discrepancy	Disc	Repeat	ALL DISC	Rank	# Insp	Disc %
C-1	3	wing mission records are not maintained properly	23	8	31	1	52	44.2%
D-7	7a	wing failed to ensure Wing or Reg CC approved acquisitions	21	4	25	2	49	42.9%
D-9	3	wing failed to comply with annual Internet Ops review requirements	23	0	23	3	40	57.5%
C-3	5	wing failed to ensure all flights flown had a proper flight release	19	3	22	4	52	36.5%
B-1	7	units in wing don't have 2 or more Grads of TLC	19	1	20	5	49	38.8%
E-3	7a	inspections weren't conducted with at least two qualified inspectors	14	6	20	5	52	26.9%
D-7	7c	all real property documents are not loaded into ORMS	11	7	18	6	49	22.4%
C-2	9d	wing didn't verify conditions and locations of all assets	13	4	17	7	52	25.0%
D-4	3b	wing failed to issue prescribing publication for all wing forms	13	4	17	7	36	36.1%
C-4	5f	wing failed to ensure biennial corrosion control accomplished	13	3	16	8	52	25.0%
C-4	5i	wing failed to ensure AIF were maintained/accurate in all corp AC	12	4	16	8	45	26.7%
E-1	5	wing failed to have all active members complete EO training	14	2	16	8	50	28.0%
C-4	2	wing failed to provide evidence of having annually done a F-71 of all AC	12	2	14	9	52	23.1%
D-7	7b	wing failed to retain CC signed memoranda approving acquisitions	14	0	14	9	49	28.6%
C-2	2a	wing did not submit annual Comm plan by 10-Apr	11	1	12	10	53	20.8%
C-4	4	wing failed to provide current Cert of Ins for all Maint Facilities	11	1	12	10	52	21.2%
C-4	5c	wing exceeded 24mo inspection of pitot-static, transponder, altimeter systems	11	1	12	10	52	21.2%
D-4	1c	wing failed to forward copy of supps/pamphlets to next higher HQ	12	0	12	10	35	34.3%
D-7	3	missing/damaged equipment not properly reported in ORMS	10	2	12	10	54	18.5%
D-7	4	transfer of non-expendable property in wing not properly documented in ORMS	12	0	12	10	52	23.1%

Top REPEAT Discrepancies - CYCLE 5 - Ranked by Occurrence

Tab	Ques #	Question	# of DISC	# of Repeats	Total Disc	Rank	# of Insp with ?	Discr %
C-1	3	wing mission records are not maintained properly	23	8	31	1	52	44.2%
D-7	7c	all real property documents are not loaded into ORMS	11	7	18	2	49	22.4%
E-3	7a	inspections weren't conducted with at least two qualified inspectors	14	6	20	3	52	26.9%
D-7	7a	wing failed to ensure Wing or Reg CC approved acquisitions	21	4	25	4	49	42.9%
D-4	3b	wing failed to issue prescribing publication for all wing forms	13	4	17	4	36	36.1%
C-2	9d	wing didn't verify conditions and locations of all assets	13	4	17	4	52	25.0%
C-4	5i	wing failed to ensure AIF were maintained/accurate in all corp AC	12	4	16	4	45	26.7%
E-3	5	wing failed to ensure SUIs were conducted within max of 27 months	2	4	6	4	52	3.8%
E-1	9a	subordinate unit exceeded the 27 month limit between SUI & not referred to command for suspension	1	4	5	4	51	2.0%
C-3	5	wing failed to ensure all flights flown had a proper flight release	19	3	22	5	52	36.5%
C-4	5f	wing failed to ensure biennial corrosion control accomplished	13	3	16	5	52	25.0%

"The top experts in the world are ardent students. The day you stop learning, you're definitely not an expert."

—Brendon Burchard, Author



Stay Tuned!

- **COMPLAINT RESOLUTION COURSE**

This basic online IO course has been totally restructured due to the changes that have occurred in the CR processes and is currently undergoing user testing. This revised course will carry a student from the basics through completion of a Complaint Analysis. If you have not yet completed the former IG Senior Course, you will be required to retake this new course since additional topics have been added. It will be opened for use once the new CAPR 20-1 and CAPP 40-20 are published.

- **ADVANCED INSPECTION COURSE**

This course is being made available to assist those SUI Team Members who aspire to become Team Chiefs for Sub-Unit Compliance Inspections. It will also be a prerequisite for those attending the IG Master Course in the Inspection path and will satisfy the academic requirement for the Senior rating. This course went live on 12 Dec 2020. The course is by invitation only and you must get your Wing IG's approval. *The prerequisite courses are Introduction to Inspections and the IA Qualification courses.*

- **ADVANCED COMPLAINT RESOLUTION COURSE**

This course is in development and will replace the former IG Senior Course for those in the CR path. It will be offered as an online course and will deal 100% with an investigation. It will be a prerequisite for anyone in the CR path who desires to attend the IG College and will satisfy the training requirement for the Senior rating. It is planned to be rolled out by mid-May 2021.

- **IG MASTER COURSE**

Going forward the IG College will be known as the IG Master Course. It will be an annual offering with dual curricula. One for Complaint Resolution leading to eligibility for being appointed as a NCRO. The other will be for Inspections leading to eligibility for being appointed as a NCIO. This course will satisfy the training requirement for the Master rating. The time and place will be determined by the CAP/IG. For 2021 it is planned to occur in a hybrid format (no face-to-face) in late July-early August. Each webinar will occur on a Saturday and will last approximately 2 hours. Students will be required to submit work products that will be graded by the IGMG staff. Prerequisites will be *either* the Advanced Inspection Course for the Inspection path or the Advanced CR Course for the CR path. If you had completed the former IG Senior Course since 2019 you would have met the prerequisite for the CR path.

**"You can never be overdressed
or over-educated."**

– Oscar Wilde



Upcoming Wing-Level Compliance Inspections

WING	CI DATES	CYCLE/INSP#
NE	17-18 Apr 21	5-50 (RI)
NM	1-2 May 21	6-5
TN	22-23 May 21	6-6
ME	26-27 Jun 21	6-7
GA	10-11 Jul 21	6-8

LMS/AXIS - IG Point of Contact

**LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS and AXIS COORDINATOR
FOR IG COURSES IS COL ED BURNS at igt@capnhq.gov**

Contact me if you notice any discrepancies/issues with the IG course materials in LMS or AXIS. We are in the process of moving all IG courses from LMS to AXIS.