



CIVIL AIR PATROL INSPECTOR

IG AUDIENCE

Volume 13 Issue 3

July 2022

PLEASE FORWARD THIS TO ALL UNITS IN YOUR WING!

From Col Jay Burrell, CAP/IG:



Hello everyone!

Summer is finally here and with it comes our busiest time for CAP. This is when flight academies, encampments, special activities like Blue Beret and Hawk Mountain happen. It is also when we see more complaints filed because of any number of issues. As IGs, each of you is in a unique position to provide assistance to those who feel wronged. FEEL is the key operating word here because many times the member is feeling singled out, harassed, and in general despondent. They don't FEEL they have any other option but to file a complaint. How can we help our senior members and cadets explore options other than that last desperate effort of filing a complaint?

What is an Ombudsman? According to Webster, the word comes from two Old Norse words, Umboth (Commission) and Mathr (Man). The Commission Man was appointed to investigate complaints against government officials and agencies. What are the duties of an Ombudsman? According to Wikipedia the typical duty of an Ombudsman is to investigate complaints and attempt to resolve them usually through mediation.

All IGs can utilize this technique and we refer to it in the IG Corps as an ASSIST. By bringing two parties together it is easy to resolve issues and prevent a complaint from being filed, once you know the circumstances surrounding the issue and can bring the two parties together to resolve the problem. Remember, the first step in resolving a problem is knowing that the problem exists. If someone FEELS they are being picked on the easiest resolution is to let the person know that this problem exists. Through an ASSIST you can often resolve the problem quickly and with satisfaction for both parties. If this is unsuccessful, then filing a complaint may be the only option.

Please review CAPR 20-2 para 10.1 to review who may file a complaint with the IG. Complaints can be invasive, lengthy and result in a lack of satisfaction for all parties involved. Especially if we are dealing with FEELINGS and not violations of a regulation. With an ASSIST, we can possibly get a quick resolution and satisfaction for all parties involved without the invasiveness of an investigation.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to reach out to either your Wing or Region IG's or the National IG Staff. We are willing to help guide you through this process to better use all the tools available to us as Inspectors General.



The Commanders' Corner

Items of Command Interest



Repeat Discrepancies – More work for less reward?

By Col Russell Chazell CAP/IGI

When I was a kid and would complain about how hard some aspect of my childhood life was, my parents would frequently tell me that I had it easy and that when they were kids, they walked to school uphill in both directions in a blizzard. We've probably all heard such hyperbole as children, and if you were like me, you laughed it off as ridiculous. But as an adult with a few miles on my pedometer, I now understand what my parents were trying to teach me. They were using an outrageous example to show me that my situation was not so bad and that I should be grateful for what I have, and that if I would focus on the task at hand – rather than grouse about it – it would be finished in short order. The longer I grumbled and procrastinated, the further behind I got, and the problem became worse, not better. In the end, it took more work for less reward to solve the problem. Of course, my parents were right.



You're probably wondering what this has to do with the CAP IG inspection program. I'm thinking of how much harder a unit – whether in CI or SUI space – must work to receive an effective grade when they have to factor in the extra hits that a repeat discrepancy gives their scores. Again, more work for less reward.

CAPR 20-3 (5 Aug 2019) discusses repeat discrepancies. Specifically, paragraph 7.3.2 states that “[r]epeat discrepancies in a Tab will increase the percentage from 60% to 70% in order to receive an effective grade in that tab.” So, if a unit has a repeat discrepancy, that unit must work 10% harder to receive an effective grade – more work for the same reward. Since CI's and SUI's are open-book tests with the answers provided up front, one wonders why there are ever repeat discrepancies. The previous report showing all the previous discrepancies is easily available to the unit commander. What's going on here? Are the requirements so difficult that units cannot comply? Has there been commander or staff turnover and the incumbent doesn't know about the previous findings? Do they not care? I think it could be any or all these root causes in varying degrees that contribute to units, particularly subordinate units, confusion about the impact that repeat discrepancies have on their hard work to demonstrate compliance with CAP programs and regulations.



As inspectors – whether National Compliance Inspection Officers or Wing Inspection Augmentees – we have a duty to verify compliance per the dictates of the CAP Inspection Program. But we also have a duty to help units understand the path to success so that they're not always walking uphill in the blizzard of compliance elements.

I was recently privileged to attend the Middle Atlantic Region 2022 IG Summit (my thanks to Col Ray Harris for the invitation and kudos for identifying the frequent flyer discrepancies). During that Summit, I learned that the top SUI Discrepancies in MAR are:

Tab B1 (CP), Question 6 (Annual CP Goals) – 15.8% of all discrepancies

Tab E1 (CC), Question 7 (Documentation Uploaded On Time) – 11.9% of all discrepancies

Tab D3 (FM), Question 3 (FM Committee Meetings and Minutes) – 8.8% of all discrepancies

Tab E1 (CC), Question 1 (Unit Positions Filled) – 5.6% of all discrepancies

Tab D3 (FM), Question 5 (FM Committee Appointments) – 4.3% of all discrepancies

These MAR numbers are likely typical of other regions. The point of sharing them is to demonstrate that a focused effort in a few subject areas would pay big dividends to the units as they prepare. Top discrepancies are, in my view, repeat discrepancy magnets. Go after the low hanging fruit and raise one's chances of acing the open-book test.



In the realm of CI's, I've noticed one repeat discrepancy magnet that could be easily resolved – that is Tab C1, (Mission Management), Question 3 (Are all records pertaining to each authorized mission loaded into WMIRS?). Nearly every CI report I've seen since being appointed CAP/IGI have this discrepancy. In many cases, it is a repeat discrepancy. Again, focused command emphasis in this area should eliminate the issue and make it easier to get that coveted "Effective" in Mission Management.

Of course, every compliance element is important and required to be met. Our units function more effectively when they follow the regulations, and it provides the taxpayer with assurance that their money is being used wisely and appropriately as we perform our *Missions for America*. As inspectors, I suggest that when we hold our in-briefs (in CI space) and issue our 60-day notice letters (in SUI space), that we inform the units of those discrepancy magnets that they may not be considering. Some of them are easy fixes – like CP goals or FM committee minutes – that units can be working throughout the cycle. I also suggest that Wing IGs request time at their Commander's Calls to brief the unit commanders on these issues and offer assistance to them – like Staff Assistance Visits that used to be done – so they can better understand the process and proactively resolve any potential potholes in their path. At this point in the process, it may be too late to prevent a discrepancy, but it may be early enough to help the unit close it during the onsite portion or quickly after the inspection is over.

In a perfect world, we would have a zero-discrepancy organization. That may not be a reasonable outcome but I'm confident that, working together, we can get as close to that result as possible.

"You make mistakes. Mistakes don't make you.

---Maxwell Maltz



Required Duty Positions in Wing Sub-Unit Compliance Inspections

Lt Col Craig Gallagher/CAP/NCIO

As inspectors, we are tasked to determine if sub-unit duty positions are filled and appointed correctly.

The excerpt below is from the SUI Tab E-1 (Commander) Inspection Knowledge Base (IKB):

E-1 COMMAND

Questions

Type	#	Topic/Detailed Question	How to verify compliance	Discrepancy Write up	How to Clear
SUI	01	Are unit positions filled and appointed correctly?	Use eServices duty assignment report, verify all unit director positions filled.	(Discrepancy): [xx] (E1 Question 1) Unit positions were not filled IAW CAPR 35-1 paras 1-3 & 1-3a.	Appoint personnel to unit positions. Attach a copy of updated eServices duty assignment report to the discrepancy in the Discrepancy Tracking System (DTS). Attach a plan of action, approved by Unit/CC, to prevent reoccurrence to the discrepancy in the DTS.

The short answer to the question is that CAPR 35-1 tells us how to correctly appoint unit positions, but the other CAP regulations don't tell us what unit positions must be filled, except for the Safety Officer and the Finance Officer. No inspector could be faulted for always answering "Yes" because the duty assignment report only contains correctly appointed unit positions (other than those on a CAPF 2A). Until the OPR (NHQ/DP) decides to eliminate the question or replace it based on new/revised regulations, we should embrace the spirit of the question, which suggests that all directors (should be "staff") positions are filled according to the needs of the unit. The inspector and the Commander should be able to reach agreement on the necessary positions. I recommend the following duty positions be assigned within a subordinate unit, based on required work. A discrepancy should be written for needed duty positions not filled.

Staff Position	Assignment
Aerospace Ed. (AE)	all units
Safety (SE)	all units
Administration (DA)	all units

Personnel Officer (DP)	all units
Prof. Development (PD)	all units
Public Affairs (PA)	all units
Cadet Programs (CP)	units with cadets
Finance (FM)	units with funds
Logistics (LG)	units with CAP property
Communications (DC)	units with CAP communications equipment

Some larger units should have more positions filled - but those listed above are the minimum. Most units have some members appointed to multiple positions and some have members from other units assigned to positions within the unit. The Commander can even appoint himself/herself to those positions (except Finance Officer and Testing Officer).

Blast from the Past [article above]

There have been several questions about the difference between Tab E1 (CC), Question 1, (Are all unit positions filled and appointed correctly?) and Tab D5 (DP), Question 1, (Are unit positions updated in eServices/CAPFs 2a upon appointment by Unit CC?).

In short, the Tab D5 question is intended to ensure that staff officers are appointed correctly; meaning that the appointment(s) is reflected in eServices using the Duty Assignment Module, or a properly completed CAPF 2a exists, or a Personnel Authorization (*see* CAPR 10-3) has been issued. This topic has been covered in the July 2017 editions of the *Audience* (“Required Duty Positions in Subordinate Units,” by Lt Col Craig Gallagher, former CAP/IGI) and is reproduced here as a refresher.



**“If I cannot do great things, I can do
small things in a great way.**

---Martin Luther King Jr.



Tips for Preparing for a Compliance Inspection (CI)

By Col Steve Miller, CAP/IGIA/NCIO

Step 1) Find the date of your upcoming CI. This link takes you to the schedule. [CI Schedule](#)

Step 2) The wing may start preparing for the inspection any time it wants; however, it is suggested to begin CI preparation 6 – 12 months prior to the CI. Doing so may allow the wing to fix things prior to the inspection.

- 1) Get the worksheets for the inspection. Prior to your inspection you will find current inspection worksheets on the IG website under “Compliance Inspection Information”. Use this link: [CI Worksheets](#). On the right side of the page, under “Related Documents”, you will find the current inspection worksheets. You can download them individually or all of them in a zipped format by clicking on the “Zipped CI Worksheets” link.
- 2) Distribute the appropriate worksheets to you staff.
- 3) Each worksheet shows the compliance questions and how to verify compliance.
- 4) Go through each worksheet question. If you can answer “yes” to the questions and have back up to support your answers you should be good to go.
- 5) If you answer “no” to any question, you have time to fix the problem. Many questions answered “no” can be fixed prior to your inspection. You can go the [IG Inspections Knowledgebase](#) for specific requirements to close a discrepancy. Again many, but not all, discrepancies may be closed prior to the inspection.

Step 3) Approximately 75 days before the CI begins NHQ sends out an email to the Wing CC with information pertaining to the inspection. At that time all blank worksheets to be used for the inspection will be uploaded in the documentation section for your wing in eServices ([CI Documents](#)).

Once on that site, choose your wing. There you will find the blank worksheets to be used for your inspection. **Even if these worksheets are different from those you downloaded earlier or if newer worksheets come out later, these are the worksheets that will be used for the inspection. They will match the grade resolution calculator and CI Report that will be used for the inspection.**

There has been some confusion on which worksheets should be used for the CI inspection. By using worksheets found in the documentation section in eServices there should be no confusion. This process is designed to allow the inspected wing and the inspectors to both be on the same pages for the inspection.



Assist & Eagle Look

By Col Chery Fielitz-Scarborough CAP/IGTA

In the opening article, Col Jay Burrell discussed helping members resolve issues of being left out, picked on or feelings being hurt, and this is noted as an ASSIST. In CAPR 20-2 an ASSIST is one of four dispositions that may result from completing a Complaint Analysis (CA) from a CAPF 20. An ASSIST is defined as: the National Complaint Resolution Officer (NCRO) working with the complainant to find a way to bring a resolution without continuing the Complaint Resolution (CR) process.

Assisting members can also be a result of conducting an Eagle Look. An Eagle Look can occur after a CA has been completed or even during the investigation process. A commander can even request an Eagle Look be conducted by submitting a CAPF 20. An Eagle Look is defined as: a comprehensive examination of an allegation towards identifying systemic and/or cultural issues in a program, process, or procedure

The IG Corps encourages resolution of issues at the lowest possible level. Helping bring members together to take care of issues with an ASSIST is preferable and we will utilize this disposition to its fullest. “Experienced inspectors would be able to help with Best Practice suggestions” (Col Jack Schupp) We are NOT discouraging the filing of complaints, rather our goal is to help members receive resolution.



The IG College 2022

By Col Ed Burns, CAP/IGT

I am happy to announce that the IG College (IGC) for 2022 has begun! There are 30 students from across CAP who are taking advantage of this required course in the IG Specialty Track. While successful completion is required for all Wing IGs per CAPR 20-1 paras 8.1.1 and 8.3 there are IGAs and members of Wing Command Staffs who have also opted to apply for this training opportunity

The concentration for the 2022 IGC is Inspections. Because of travel limitations related to Covid, this year’s IGC is being presented virtually via a series of 4 webinars during the months of July through October.

The class will be concentrating on the current inspection processes, interviewing, examining the proposed 4-Tier Grading System, identifying, and writing Commendable justifications and using the Discrepancy Tracking System. Graduates of the IGC will fulfill the academic requirement for the IG Master rating as well as being eligible to be appointed as National Compliance Inspection Officers (NCIOs).

The next IGC will be offered in 2023 at a place and time decided by the CAP/IG. It will encompass both Inspection and Complaint Resolution options.



This section of the newsletter addresses questions submitted by our readers through the surveys at the end of the quizzes. If one person has a question, there must be others wondering why things occur the way they do. Questions posed by readers also provide the staff with a ‘new look’ about procedures/processes, etc.

1. Q: How should the wing IG educate their wing members?

A: The wing IG can hold summits during the wing conf, send out newsletters via email, post updates on the wing website or give briefings during wing staff meetings. There are certainly other ways this education can be performed. Keeping the wing members up to date on IG Corps changes and preparing for Sub-Unit and wing inspections is important. For CR issues, how to use the online CAPF 20.

2. Q: Is it possible to do some in person training and / or zoom capabilities for training? (This question has been asked numerous times)

A: The NHQ and region IG staff have zoom or team meetings usually once a month and we encourage our region IGs to do the same with their wing IGs. Also, IG Summits in conjunction with another CAP activity is encouraged. There is also the option for presenting the Advanced Inspection Course, the Basic and Advanced CR Courses in person. If you are interested in presenting such a course in conjunction with a Region/Wing Conference, contact igt@capnhq.gov.

3. Q: What is the recommendation on repeating the IGC? I last took it in 2012.

A: It is a good idea to repeat IGC if we have open seats. If you are an active/appointed IG or IGA or IA, your request can be coordinated through your region IG who will work with the NHQ/IGT.



Upcoming Wing/Region-Level Compliance Inspections

WING	CI DATES	CYCLE/INSP #
GLR	23 – 24 July	6-22
IL	6 – 7 Aug	6-23
MO	10 – 11 Sept	6-24
PR	1 – 2 Oct	6-25

LMS/AXIS - IG Point of Contact

**LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM 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.

**THE AUDIENCE EDITOR: Col Cheryl Fielitz-Scarborough at
cfielitzscarborough@cap.gov**

CAP/IG: Col Jay Burrell at ig@capnhq.gov

CAP/IGQ (Complaints): Lt Col Preston Perrenot at igg@capnhq.gov

CAP/IGI (Inspections): Col Russell Chazell at igi@capnhq.gov

CAP/IGT (Training): Col Ed Burns at igt@capnhq.gov