FORWARD THIS NEWSLETTER TO <u>ALL</u> UNITS IN YOUR WING!

<u>**A note from Col Tom Kettell, CAP/IG:**</u> **The IG Audience has evolved from a newsletter to being the Education Journal for the IG Program. Each quarterly issue has introduced a quality tool (or two) that will be implemented into program operations. The use of these tools by Wing IGs (first) and then Wing/Unit Commanders (with mentorship and assistance from IG) will be a contributing element towards moving CAP in the direction of continuous improvement and the establishment of a quality culture.**

NOTE TO ALL WING IGs

The Discrepancy Tracking System (DTS) software has been upgraded and successfully tested for entering SUI Discrepancies. All discrepancies from SUIs are now to be uploaded in the eServices IG Module (after uploading the report) using the DTS-Other link.

Instructions (presentations and videos) are available on the NHQ/IG DTS Page to help ensure that the steps are properly accomplished (and in a standardized manner) from entering discrepancies through closure.

What is IG Refresher Credit and Why would Anyone Care?

by Lt Col Craig Gallagher, *CAP/IGT*

The 31 December 2013 release of CAPR 123-1 Para 10e states:

*"CAP IGs at all levels **will** complete annual refresher training. This training may include a briefing by the next higher level IG, completion of any IG professional development course or serving as instructor (or assistant to an instructor) of any IG professional development course. Completion of this requirement will be reported to the CAP/IGT, who is responsible for tracking this requirement."*

The next release of CAPR 123-1 will enhance this requirement to say:

*"All appointed Inspectors General **will** complete annual refresher training. Options to complete this training can be in these approved formats:*

(1) Annual refresher training provided on-line through eServices LMS by the CAP-IG staff,

(2) Take, retake, assist in the teaching, or teach (where practical) the IG Senior or College courses,

(3) An outline/syllabus for an approved refresher training event submitted by the Region IG with his/her assurance that all IGs in attendance satisfactorily completed the event.

> *Completion of Option 3 will be reported to and approved by the CAP/IGT, who is responsible for tracking this requirement."*

I **boldfaced** the "will" in both versions of CAP 123-1 to emphasize that the refresher training is not optional.

IG Refresher credit has been given under all three options outlined above.

Option (3) can be satisfied at a wing or region conference, but you do have to 'sell' your program to the IGT that it is substantial enough to qualify for a full year's worth of IG Refresher credit. You will need to submit a robust syllabus that outlines subjects and time spent on each subject and sign-in sheets for attendees.

Option (2) is great if you have the time and money to attend or teach either the IG Senior Course or the IG College. This will earn you a full year's IG Refresher credit.

Option (1) currently has three choices:

1. IG Refresher parts 1 through 4 – this is a quiz on quarterly IG Audience articles
2. IG Inspection Augmentee (IA) Course – required only once for SUI Inspectors
3. IG Investigating Officer (IO) Course – required only once for investigators

The first thing that jumps out at you is that the IA and IO courses are normally only taken once whereas the IG Refresher comes with four new quizzes a year, each based on the IG Audience. The easiest and most effective way to keep your IG Refresher credit current is to spend an hour reading the IG Audience and taking the 10 minute quiz. With an investment of less than 5 hours per year, you can keep IG Refresher current and stay up-to-date on IG issues in CAP.

SUI Team Chiefs: A Couple of Helpful Hints

by Don Barbalace, CAP/IGTA

First of all, I assure you that the new system works - and works well. One wing IG reported doing a complete SUI in an *hour* – that's in and out in an *hour*! You can do it too, for real. The days of the 4-hour SUI are gone and good riddance! However, this will require that you educate unit commanders on the new way to do it. CAPR 123-3 para 12 is specific about the requirements, but there is some flexibility as to who does the work of preparing documents. I come from a small wing and see a need sometimes to do things a little differently, within acceptable limits, in small wings.

When arranging to do an SUI, first send the worksheets to the unit well ahead of time – 60 days is required by regulation – so they know what they will be asked. Get the inspection documents set at capmembers.com > CAP National Headquarters > Inspector General > SUI Information by downloading "All SUI documents (Zipped)" into a folder for that squadron. The worksheets are subject to change, so always download a new set for every inspection.

At 30 days before the inspection, select your team and assign them their tabs, providing copies of the worksheets. Instruct them on doing the telephone interviews. (More on that later.)

Now we have two approaches here depending on what works for you.

1. Have the units answer as many questions as they can on the worksheets and return them to the inspector or to team chief. You have to instruct them on returning the worksheets. Here you find that inexperienced unit staff members often do not return the worksheets. The second approach:

2. I prefer to start the worksheets myself, and get the answers live during the telephone interview, so I instruct the commanders to NOT send them back with answers. For me, the phone interviews are faster and more effective, and produce less anxiety for the unit.

Then about 2 weeks out, provide the team members with appropriate Member Reports (membership, duty assignment, professional development, and maybe others as needed). These reports can be uploaded to the Documentation file, but then you must tell your team to download them. Alternatively, you can just email the reports to the team. I find the latter works better.

Phone interviews: The worksheets are already shorter than the old SUI Guide – about half as many questions – and about half of the questions can be answered on the phone. Some others can be answered with eServices data. Some entire tabs can be inspected remotely through a combination of eServices, phone interviews, and uploaded documentation. Use eServices and the Member Reports to answer as many questions as you can *before* you telephone the responsible unit staff member. Then set up an appointment to interview the person on the phone. Anything you can answer at this point will save time on the day of the inspection. The telephone interview is *part of the inspection*! Do it right, and your on-site interview will only take about 10 minutes.

Uploading documentation: Some questions will require the inspector to see or handle documentation (eyes on; hands on – EOHO), but there usually is no need to wait while someone hunts up the paperwork so you can look at it. Instead, have the interviewee UPLOAD the documents at eServices > Inspector General > Documentation. The uploads are *part of the inspection*! Anything you can examine on-line in the comfort of your home or office is that much less time spent on-site during an SUI.

Inspector data entry: As the inspectors obtain answers by phone or through uploaded documents, or later during the face-to-face portion of the interview (if needed – and it is not always needed) the inspectors will update the information on their respective worksheets. The Team Chief has to *transfer* it to the SUI Report, but it will be helpful if the inspector has already written the commendables and discrepancies, which can then be copied and pasted by the Team Chief. So, all the worksheets should be completely filled out: every question answered and especially the last page of each tab, which will have Benchmarks, Commendables, Discrepancies, and Areas of Concern that the Team Chief will copy and paste into the SUI report without modification. These worksheets, along the Grade Res Calculator spreadsheet need to be uploaded into the Documentation folder.

Inspectors must make a judgment in the line near the top labeled "Mission Rating." Using the drop-down menu, select the appropriate description of the tab results – "meets mission requirements" or whatever other determination is appropriate. This is your only opportunity to add a subjective evaluation to the tab, and is the only way to get a grade above Successful. There is an effort underway to make this more objective by attaching an appendix at the back of each regulation that will identify which items beyond compliance will affect mission ratings.

Team Chief: Do you have an inspector who cannot use a computer at all? No problem. Just print out the worksheet and do it with pen and paper. It works fine. The team chief is the only one who absolutely must use a computer. The disadvantage is that the team chief has to type the commendables and discrepancies.

You need to edit the SUI Report template as needed. Enter the Executive Summary, key personnel, and team members as always in the text boxes for that purpose.

Inspectors will pass their interview results to the team chief by electronic means, or on paper. The Team Chief will enter the data to the SUI Report and use the Grade Calculator to determine the grade for each tab. The Mission Rating has a point value as follows:

5   far exceeds mission requirements (must be supported by Benchmarks and/or Commendables)

4   exceeds mission requirements (must be supported by Benchmarks and/or Commendables)

3   meets mission requirements

2   does not meet some mission requirements (must be supported by Discrepancies and/or Areas of Concern)

1   does not meet mission requirements (must be supported by Discrepancies and/or Areas of Concern)

The Grade Res Cal spreadsheet has four worksheet tabs: Grade Res Cal, SUI Qual Assurance Checklist, Calculator Rules and Code Documentation. The numeric values shown above are entered to the grade calculator on the "Grade Res Cal" tab. The default value already in place is 3. Change it as needed. Then enter all the question responses. The default answer already in place is Y, but use the drop-down menu to select N or N/A if applicable. Do that for each inspection area. When you finish, the overall grade is shown at the top. The Calculator Rules tab explains the rationale for the grading.

Clean up the unused special report entries (delete them), tally the commendables and discrepancies, and proceed to grade resolution. Use the second ("SUI Qual Assurance Checklist") worksheet tab to check your work – make sure you didn't miss anything. Then you are ready to upload your discrepancies to eServices > Inspector General > DTS –Other.

Finally, upload the completed SUI Report to eServices > Inspector General > Report Upload – Other.

The Report of Investigation Legal Officer Review

by Col Jack Schupp, CAP/IGQ

The completion of the CAP Legal Officer Sufficiency Review is one of several steps that the IG or IO ensures is included in the Report of Investigation (ROI) that is sent to the Appointing Authority/Commander. Sometimes the Legal Sufficiency Review is not so "sufficient" and is frequently little more than a couple of e-mail lines stating that the Legal Officer (LO) looked at the ROI and the findings are supported by the preponderance of evidence. That is an inadequate Legal Officer Sufficiency Review and the IG/IO must insist that the LO provide more than a superficial cursory look at the ROI in order to assure due diligence and discharge of our mutual fiduciary obligations to the corporation.

At a minimum, the LO must:

1. Review (a) the complaint and (b) the allegations as restated by the IG/IO and (c) the ROI to verify that the complaint should not be dismissed (i.e., the complaint if true would violate a CAP rule, regulation or standard)
2. A review of the ROI to determine if each substantiated allegation in the complaint is supported by the preponderance of evidence
3. A review of the standards cited in the ROI to determine whether their interpretation is consistent with known CAP policy guidance

These basic elements performed by the LO <u>must</u> be included or attached in a written document to the ROI. There may be occasions where the LO and IG/IO disagree about one or more of these elements (e.g. whether the preponderance of evidence supported one conclusion or another or if the interpretation of "hostile environment" or "abuse" was properly applied to the facts). In that event, the LO must set forth the reason(s) for the disagreement between LO and IG/IO in the Legal Sufficiency Review. The IG/IO may modify the ROI in some fashion to cure the disagreement and so advise the Appointing Authority or make no changes. The LO does NOT approve or disapprove the ROI so as to compel some action from the IG/IO before submission; the LO only provides a legal opinion to the Commander/Appointing Authority as to the sufficiency of the ROI, and in what manner it is adequate or not adequate as far as assessing facts and the application of CAP standards to those facts.

After submission of the ROI complete with Legal Sufficiency Review, it is up to the Commander to determine what conclusions should be reached – particularly if opinions between LO and IG/IO differ. The IG needs to remember that the LO and the IG are both independent direct reports to the Commander; one is not superior or inferior to the other, and both exist to give their best efforts and advice to our Commanders.

A review of CAPR 123-2 (8)m(1)j by IGs and LOs would be helpful to assure that the basic protocols and expectations for Legal Sufficiency Reviews are followed.

Unit Commanders: How Much Documentation to Provide for an SUI?

by Lt Col Les Manser, CAP/IGTA

The short answer to this question is "as much as you'd like." CAP/IT has stated that there is no limit to the number of files you can upload in the documentation section of the Inspector General (IG) Module in eServices whether it is for a Compliance Inspection (CI) or a Subordinate Unit Inspection (SUI). Recently, one wing preparing for a CI uploaded more than 200 files! So there is plenty of room for any and all files needed to support subordinate unit compliance and mission performance.

There is, however, a limit on the file <u>size</u> – and that is under 3 MB. This is the standard limit for any uploads of documents in eServices. There are methods that can be used to reduce file size for the various types of files (.doc, .pdf,. xls, .jpg, etc.) - or – you could choose to break up the document into smaller segments and then identify them as such at the end of the document title – Part 1 of 4, Part 2 of 4, etc.

Keep in mind that "more" does not automatically mean "better." Before ramping up to "more," make sure you're at least meeting the <u>minimum</u> requirements for documentation first. CAPR 123-3 Paragraph 12e(4) addresses this minimum requirement which includes checklists (which are now called worksheets), unit details and other "deliverables" as specified in the worksheet instructions.

Remember that <u>completed</u> worksheets for <u>all</u> applicable areas are required to be uploaded in the IG/Document section of eServices. When the worksheet identifies a document requirement by name/title, you will need to upload that specified document as well. These are typically the records, reports, etc. that support YES answers in the worksheets.

A discrepancy can result when all of the required deliverables are not provided (i.e. uploaded in eServices/IG Module/Documents) 10 days before the start of an SUI. The requirement for deliverables is found in the Commander's worksheet; so, a discrepancy for this item would mean that the

Commander's grade would not be any higher than Successful. (This is also true for all areas; with just one compliance-related discrepancy, the Grade Resolution Calculator will not calculate an area grade any higher than Successful.)

If unit performance or operation exceeds mission requirements, then upload all of the objective evidence supporting the "above and beyond" level in your programs. This is where, with no file limit, it can benefit any unit wanting to prove or demonstrate this higher level.

There is an audit/inspection Rule of Thumb (ROT) – "If it's not documented, it doesn't exist" – so be ready to prove what you say/do with as much uploaded documentation as it takes!

What are the Wing IG's Responsibilities with Respect to Post-CI Actions?

by Col Gordon Odell, SER/IG

Conversations with wing inspectors general (IGs) reveal a great variety in the perception of their post-compliance inspection (CI) activities.

What are the wing IG's post-CI duties?

CAPR 20-1 provides: "[The wing IG is] responsible for implementing, managing and directing Inspector General programs *at the direction of the commander . . .*" and to "coordinate inspection results with the commander and staff."

What does "coordinate inspection results" mean?

The IG and commander work together to ensure that individuals responsible for inspection requirements know how their positions faired and, if further action is needed, *what* action is needed *from whom* and *when* it is due.

How?

Work with your commander. Consider this approach to keep all informed:
    1. Create a status report on outstanding discrepancies.
    2. Calculate the mandatory discrepancy closure date "within 14 months of the date of the out brief of the inspection" (CAPR 123-3) and confirm the date with the CI Team Chief. (Beware of weekends and holidays.)
    3. After the report header (e.g. "Memorandum for" etc.), note: "THESE DISCREPANCIES MUST BE CLOSED NO LATER THAN [*insert date*]!"
    4. Create a table organized by AOR (area of responsibility, from the CI Inspection Checklists). Name responsible individuals and include their contact information, e.g. cell phone numbers and email addresses.
    5. Include the "*Due Date" from the eServices page. (This is a "suspense" date that you can update in 60 day increments.)
    6. Confer with the commander to ensure the "from whom" and "when" are acceptable. (The first suspense date may be the follow up date between the individual and commander to confirm the corrective action and completion date.)
    8. Finalize the first edition with the commander and distribute to the commander and all responsible individuals. Periodically update and retransmit.

9. Suggestion: Once the individual has complied and the discrepancy is closed, include the item one more time, noting that it has been closed and when. It gives the commander an opportunity to acknowledge the contribution.

How is this helping the commander or, for that matter, the wing?

The IG is an advisor to the commander, the commander's eyes and ears. Taking these steps reminds all that you are watching and reminding on behalf of the commander.

What is my role regarding POAs (Plans of Action)?

Regulations don't set out any IG duty about them. Your commander may request your involvement. You're a member of the team and have special knowledge (exposure to POAs) and skill (writing). Be a team player – offer assistance, but don't do it for them. It's their responsibility.

What about pulling and circulating closure requirements from the CAP Knowledgebase?

Some IGs choose to do this. Certainly the IG should know the requirements in order to be of assistance. If this becomes your responsibility, your delay will cause them to delay. Confer with your commander to ensure that you aren't inadvertently relieving them of knowing their job.

2016 Inspector General College: The Search for Alternate Locations

Every time that an IG training course is conducted, its effectiveness is evaluated by CAP/IGT Staff per the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) process for continuous improvement. The evaluation (Check) of effectiveness is primarily based on daily feedback collected during the conduct of the college and Instructor/Student Critiques at the end of the course.

Evaluation Data from the past two IGCs has revealed a trend in certain limitations that are deemed critical to resolve for operational success:

- Limited internet access for multiple users
- Limited facilities access/use
- Limited Student/Instructor online curriculum support

A common cause for these limitations was the location – a military installation. As a result, one of the major actions being taken for this cause is to find other sites that would be more suitable.   The criteria that has been established for this location search is:

- Not on an AFB
- Must be near a major airport hub:
    - Atlanta – East
    - Chicago – North Central
    - Dallas – South Central
    - Denver – West
- 50-75 person Hotel Package Deal that yields a Lodging price break for attendees
- Unlimited Internet Access everywhere in the Lodging Facility

- Large Training Room capability (50-75 people) with installed set-up for Computers, AV, Screens:
- Flexible Breakout Room (Suite) Arrangements – booked as Staff Rooms

It is possible that some sites that have been used for the IG Senior Course (IGSC), National Legal Officers College (NLO) or Wing Conferences may already meet the criteria.

If so, CAP/IGT would like to know - please contact the IGC Director of Logistics, Lt Col Les Manser, at lesmanser@gmail.com.

Upcoming IG Training

APRIL 2015

IG Senior Course at PCR Conference, Seattle, WA April 19-20 2015 – contact Preston Perrenot pbperrenot@centurylink.net

IG Senior Course at SWR Conference, Oklahoma 23-24 April 2015 – contact George Shank swrinspector@gmail.com

MAY 2015

IG Senior Course, NER, in Ft. Indiantown Gap, PA May 14-15 2015 – contact Wayne Toughill, wayne@toughill.com

IG Senior Course, SER, in Mayaguez, PR May 14-15 2015 – contact Preston Perrenot pbperrenot@centurylink.net

JUNE 2015

IG Senior Course, SER, in Peachtree City, GA June 4-5 2015 – contact Larry Julian, larry.julian@gawg.cap.gov

IG Senior Course, MER, at Camp Dawson, Morgantown, WV June 5-6 2015 – contact Lynn Hoffman lhoffman@mer.cap.gov

Contact Missie, IG Support Coordinator at NHQ, mderocher-harris@capnhq.gov to enroll.

Upcoming Compliance Inspections

WING	CI DATES	CYCLE/INSP#
WV	2-3 May 15	4-29
IA	16-17 May 15	4-30
NH	13-14 Jun 15	4-31

IG Audience/LMS-IG Points of Contact

SEND ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS FOR THE IG AUDIENCE DIRECTLY TO LT COL LES MANSER at lesmanser@gmail.com.

With your article, please submit 3-5 good, multiple-choice questions and a wrong-answer feedback explanation for each question.

FINAL EDITOR FOR THE IG AUDIENCE IS LT COL DON BARBALACE at sdig.cap@gmail.com (do not send articles to him)

LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR THE IG COURSE DIRECTOR IS LT COL DON BARBALACE at sdig.cap@gmail.com