



CIVIL AIR PATROL INSPECTOR GENERAL

IG AUDIENCE

Volume 8 Issue 2

April 2017

FORWARD THIS TO ALL UNITS IN YOUR WING!



A note from Col Cheryl Fielitz-Scarborough, CAP/IG:

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 their Wing IG) will be a contributing element towards moving CAP in the direction of continuous improvement and the establishment of a quality culture.

What's New in CAPR 20-2 (replacing CAPR 123-2)

by Lt Col Preston Perrenot, CAP/IGQ

Spring is in the air and we all know what that means: Change. As part of the Concept of Operations for Publications Reengineering, CAPR 123-2, Complaints, has changed. Most notably, its number is now CAPR 20-2. Along with the format and numbering changes, we decided to bring the regulation up to date and include a few modifications. I'll summarize the major changes in this article.

1) CAPF 30, IG Personal and Fraud, Waste, & Abuse Complaint Registration (aka the Complaint Form), is now required. As we don't want to discourage members from filing legitimate complaints, we will still accept complaints via any medium as before. However now, the IG must obtain a signed CAPF 30 from the complainant prior to completion of the complaint analysis. This can be done during the clarification interview with the complainant. It is not necessary for the complainant to restate the entire complaint on the CAPF 30. Simply write "See Attached" in the Description of Allegations box. The CAPF 30 acts as a cover letter for the complaint and now contains a box that asks the complainant what regulation or standard they believe was violated. We hope this will prompt a complainant to look at the regulations before filing a complaint.



- 2) Complaints against a wing or region IG will now go to the CAP/IG, much like complaints against senior officers. The reasoning is that most complaints against a wing or region IG are filed because the complainant did not like the outcome of a complaint analysis or investigation. This type of issue is handled by an upper level review rather than a complaint analysis. If the CAP/IG determines that it is an upper level review, the review will be assigned to an appropriate review office. If the complaint involves the conduct of an Investigating Officer (IO), it will be handled like any other complaint.
- 3) Complaint analysis for a Transfer. Picture this: You are a wing IG and you receive a complaint from a cadet in your wing alleging violations of the regulations that occurred at an encampment the complainant attended in another wing a month ago. Under the old process, you would open an ECIM case and complete a complaint analysis using Transfer (one of the five complaint analysis dispositions) and send it to the wing IG in whose wing the incident occurred. Two problems immediately arise. First, what if the responsible IG, the one that is going to actually work this complaint, disagrees with the conclusions on the complaint analysis. Well, he or she will write their own complaint analysis. Now, we have two different complaint analyses in a case file, written by two different people, with different allegations and conclusions. This is like giving the plaintiff's attorney a free ticket to the buffet. The second problem is access. Depending on the responsible IG's ECIM tier, he or she may not have access to the case file and the receiving IG may not be able to assign a case outside of his or her tier. The receiving IG will have to open their own case and associate it with your case number. Examine the complaint carefully before opening a case file or starting the analysis and if you are going to transfer the case, use the Case Transfer Letter Template.
- 4) Clarification Interview is now required. We use the clarification interview to, well, obtain clarification of the statements provided by the complainant in their original complaint. If an IG felt that they had all of the information they needed in the original complaint (a rare and beautiful thing, by the way) then they didn't need to have that clarification interview. But the clarification interview is much more than that. It gives you, the IG, a chance to talk to the complainant; to tell them important things like "not all complaints are investigated" or "I'm going to send you a CAPF 30 and I need you to fill it out, sign it and return it to me." It also is an immediate follow-up to your complaint acknowledgement letter and reassures the complainant that his or her issue is being examined. So, make the phone call.
- 5) Educating Complainants. When we closed a case at the complaint analysis level, particularly if the allegation was dismissed, we used to send a one-line closure letter stating something like "Your allegations do not violate CAP regulations and therefore, this complaint is dismissed." This left a lot of complainants scratching their heads and asking why. After all, they believe that their complaint was a legitimate violation; otherwise, they wouldn't have filed it in the first place. From now on, the IG will send the complaint analysis closure letter to the complainant stating the justification for the disposition, as determined in the complaint analysis. We hope this will raise the trust level in the IG system - and maybe - teach the complainant something about the regulations that they didn't know before.
- 6) Official Complaint Analysis Templates are required. All the templates used in complaint resolution have been revised and brought up to date. There are 28 templates from the Complaint Acknowledgement Letter to the Investigation Close-Out letters and they cover just about every aspect of the complaint resolution process. These documents will be made available when CAPR 20-2 is published. Completed examples using these templates are being incorporated as attachments to the revised Complaint Investigating Officer's (IO) Guide. This is being done to create consistency across the board and prevent a case reviewer from saying "What am I looking at here?" So - sorry folks - no more Microsoft Word and or Excel creativity. The compliance elements for CAPR 20-2 have been updated to include checking for the required template use and formats so the Compliance Inspection (CI) teams will be reviewing this.

7) Frivolous Complaints. Last - but definitely not least. Frivolous complaints have been clearly defined in both CAPR 20-1 and CAPR 20-2 and can now result in adverse member action. A wing or region IG may apply the Frivolous Complaints Acid Test Flow Chart in the IO Guide to a complaint. If, after application of the Acid Test, they believe the complaint is frivolous, they will send the complaint and their recommendation to the CAP/IG. The CAP/IG office is the determining authority on frivolous complaints. If the CAP/IG office agrees, the complaint will be sent back to the submitting IG with a letter for the appointing authority stating that this complaint is in violation of the CAP regulations.

It suffices to say that there have been some significant changes to the Complaint Resolution Program and a careful examination of this new regulation (when published) is strongly recommended.



What's New in CAPR 20-3 (replaced CAPR 123-3)

by Lt Col Craig Gallagher, CAP/IGI

CAPR 20-3 is the replacement for CAPR 123-3 under the new CONOPS regulation numbering system. It was released on 20 March 2017 for preview and will become effective on 24 April 2017.

The changes sharpen the focus on compliance and conform to the new requirements for writing regulations.

- **Commendables**

The January 2017 IG Audience had an article written by Lt Col Les Manser that fully explains this subject. CAPR 20-3 para 10.3 has formalized the requirements by stating “*A Commendable indicates a highly effective process implemented over a sufficient period of time that results in exceeding mission requirements. Commendables must apply directly to a mission critical compliance question. A commendable must be process oriented; it should save money, manpower and have a benefit for the members and/or mission. The unit must provide supporting documentation to verify that their process does in fact save money, man-hours and present benefits to members and/or mission.*”

- **Tab Grades**

In an effort to keep CAP’s inspection system similar to the Air Force inspection system, we have replaced the old grades (Outstanding, Highly Successful, Successful, Marginally Successful and Unsatisfactory) with the following definitions found in para 7.2:

- **Highly Effective:** Performance or operation **exceeds** mission critical requirements, all CI worksheet areas rated as compliant. Procedures and activities are carried out in a superior manner. Resources and programs are very efficiently managed and free of deficiencies.
- **Effective:** Performance or operation **meets** mission critical requirements. Procedures and activities are carried out in an effective and competent manner. Resources and programs are efficiently managed. Minor deficiencies may exist but do not impede or limit mission accomplishment.

- **Ineffective:** Performance or operation **does not meet** mission critical requirements. Procedures and activities are not carried out in an adequate manner. Resources and programs are not adequately managed, or personnel or resources are endangered. Significant deficiencies exist that preclude or seriously limit mission accomplishment.

- **Overall Grades**
The overall grade is either **Effective** or **Ineffective**. The definition is the same as for the Tab Grades. The overall grade is determined by adding up the scores of the Tab grades (Highly Effective=3, Effective=2 and Ineffective=1) and divided by the number of Tabs inspected. Anything over 1.7 is Effective; otherwise, the grade is Ineffective. Any wing or subordinate unit getting an “Ineffective” grade will be inspected again in approximately 180 days.

- **Discrepancies**
 - For wings - must be closed within 14 months of the Out-Brief date
 - For groups/squadrons - must be closed within 6 month of the initial onsite date.
 - Discrepancies can be generated for not uploading deliverables on time (45 days before onsite date for wings, 10 days before onsite date for squadrons).
 - Non-compliance is determined by the inspection worksheets in effect at the time the wing or group/squadron is notified of the upcoming inspection. The Team Chief should send out the worksheets along with the notification.

- **Compliance Elements**
Compliance Elements created by CAPR 20-3 are listed in Attachment 1.

Too Much of a Good Thing?

by Lt Col Don Barbalace, CAP/IGTA

A reader asked how to train and keep motivated a large influx of wing Inspection Augmentees. Inspection Augmentees (IAs) are wonderful. God bless them! They make the IG’s life so much easier when setting up an SUI. And from the reader’s question, it seems, we may have too many of them in some wings.

We began training IAs in 2014, and trained hundreds of them each year. At present, we have about 550 people enrolled in the Inspection Augmentee Course. That crop alone would be an average of five IAs for every wing, and then there are hundreds more who completed the course each year in 2014, 2015, and 2016. What are all these people doing? Have we got too many?

In a large wing, a large pool of IAs is helpful so units don’t see the same inspectors all the time, and it may help with travel costs. However, there is a difference between a sufficient pool and an excess. You have an excess when there are so many that they cannot participate in an SUI at least once a year.

The first part of the reader’s question is how to train them. That’s the easy part. People can sign up for the IA Course on their own initiative; no approval is required. Then the wing IG or any Team Chief setting up an inspection can include the IA student in an inspection. Any qualified inspector (even the



IA student from last month's inspection) can mentor the new student during his or her first hands-on inspection. So, training is not an issue.

The second part of the question is how to keep them motivated, and therein lies the rub. *You must have work for them.* It is very discouraging to take training for a job and then not have anything to do. And then your training gets old, you forget too much, and are no longer competent to do the job.

Another aspect of this – a possible indication of over-supply – is that some people have been enrolled in the course for over a year and have not completed it. Sometimes they have nothing left to do but be included in an inspection team, but no one has seen fit to include them in that last step of training.

So, who has control over this? Not NHQ - not at all. All we do at NHQ is check the submission. That is an all or none proposition.

The only one with any control here is the Wing IG, who may need to better monitor enrollment in the IA course. Some people may take the academic part of the course as a means of learning more about the IG system with no intention of being an inspector. Commanders are particularly encouraged to take IG courses, but they need to complete the hands-on part of the IA course since this is one prerequisite for the IG Senior Course (IGSC). Wing Commanders are highly encouraged to train through the IGSC level.

Please don't discourage experienced people who want to enter the IG specialty track and need the IA Course before taking the IGSC to become an IGA, but maybe you have too many people who want to inspect, but do nothing else. Some may be valued subject-matter experts, but you don't need 43 Administration Tab inspectors.

Again, the only one with any control here is the Wing IG. It is the IG who must manage the inspection program, and that includes provision for sufficient training of new inspectors.



Inspection Sampling

by Lt Col Les Manser, CAP/IGT

You have all used this quality tool - albeit informally - throughout your life. You've inspected and tested goods (products – food, clothes, cars, etc.) and then – whether it was a sample size of one or many - decided if you wanted to buy (accept) or not buy (reject) the product. This disposition (determination) was most likely based on your personal accept/reject criteria developed (at least in your mind) for each product.

Formal acceptance sampling procedures became common during World War II. Products were inspected upon delivery to the U.S. military to ensure conformance to requirements. Sampling was first used as an alternative to the 100% testing of bullets. The dilemma was - if every bullet was tested in advance - no bullets would be left to ship! Conversely, if none were tested, malfunctions might occur in the field of battle - with potentially disastrous results.

It was decided that a sample size (quantity) would be picked at random from the lot of bullets - and on the basis of information (data) that was yielded by the sample - a decision would be made regarding the disposition of the lot. If the number of defects did not exceed a specified acceptance number identified in the specified Sampling Plan (defining the Acceptable Quality Level - AQL), the entire lot was accepted. Any defects found in the sample were repaired locally, scrapped or returned to the producer.

If the number of defects in the sample became greater than the specified acceptance number, the military consumer would subject the entire lot to 100% inspection or reject the entire lot and return it to the producer.

Acceptance sampling is "the middle of the road" approach between no inspection and 100% inspection. A 100% inspection is preferred but it is exactly what it sounds like - a check of every single item/record associated with the product. A 100% inspection of a specific compliance item/record is made easier when a report exists for it – but this is not always available.

Acceptance sampling is employed when:

- The cost of 100% inspection is very high
- 100% inspection takes too much time
- 100% inspection is impractical due to limited inspection resources

Anything short of a 100% inspection inherently adds the risk of not detecting all defects; so a Sampling Plan should be selected that provides a fairly high level of confidence in the sample size without compromising the desired level of inspection quality.

It was only a matter of time before organizational quality systems – both military and non-military - used this same inspection approach for determining compliance to specified regulations, procedures and standards. Records – the proof of compliance - became the main “product” to inspect. Other products – manufactured aircraft, vehicles, equipment, systems, etc. – were physically inspected and became Eyes On – Hands On (EO-HO) compliance items.

Similarly, formal Sampling Plans with various levels of assurance (confidence) were established for use by inspectors. The Sampling Plan selected by CAP/IG is shown below and was devised to provide a 92.5% inspection assurance level.

LOT SIZE	SAMPLE SIZE (MIN)	TREND
2-8	2	2
9-15	3	2
16-25	5	3
26-50	8	4
51-90	13	7
91-150	20	10

The LOT SIZE is the total number of items/records of a particular type available for inspection. The corresponding SAMPLE SIZE is the minimum number of items/records to inspect. The TREND number (threshold) clearly defines when a CI/SUI discrepancy is issued (at or above the threshold) or not issued (below the threshold) for a specific compliance item/sub-item/record as defined in the worksheets.

There is a bit of thought that is applied by the inspector for the sampling of some compliance items. When ES Mission Records are sampled for a CI, it first starts with identifying the number of applicable ES Missions completed over the past four years (i.e. since the last CI). For example, if the total amount of applicable and completed ES Mission Numbers (LOT SIZE) is between 51-90, then the SAMPLE SIZE becomes 13 ES Mission Numbers as a minimum. Under each of these ES Mission Numbers, there could be up to 13 different records required to be maintained per CAPR 60-3 Para 1-21. Each record type would then have a TREND of 7 applied to determine whether a discrepancy is issued (7 or more missing) for a particular record.

Some worksheets have multiple sub-items that include their own tailored discrepancy (like CI Tab C-4 – Aircraft Management - Items 5 a-j & 6 a-k), so each of these sub-items - by themselves - would need to have the sample threshold reached/exceeded to issue a discrepancy for that particular sub-item.

Non-compliance items that do not reach the threshold in Tab areas are to be verbally communicated to the Wing/Unit OPR and Wing/Unit CC for their action - or - formally written into the report as an Area of Concern (AoC) if warranted. An example of this would be to address a common process breakdown seen across multiple Tabs/areas.

It is important that the sampling used by inspectors be standardized for CIs and SUIs and sticking to the IG Sampling Plan will ensure that this occurs. This sampling approach is addressed in the IA Course for application during SUIs and in the IG Senior Course for application during CIs.

New Feature in the IG Audience – “What’s New?”

by Lt Col Don Barbalace, CAP/IGTA



We plan to list new IG-related things in each issue of the IG Audience. This is what we have for this issue:

New ICLs – CAPR 123-1 and CAPR 123-2 (soon to be 20-1 and 20-2). The numbering of the CAPR 123-series of regulations is changing to the CAPR 20-series along with some content changes. Interim Change Letters (ICLs) are being used to implement the changes to the existing regulations until the new regulations are published.

New IO Guide and new/updated templates. The new complaint regulation changes some complaint handling procedures and creates some new or updated templates. Hence, a revision of the Complaint Investigating Officer’s Guide (“IO Guide”) is being prepared to match the new regulation.

New CAPP 203. The IG Specialty Track Guide is being revised and updated to comply with the new 20-series regulations. This is currently in the DRAFT stage and is planned to be out this summer.

Time limit on the IA Course. With many students enrolled in the Inspection Augmentee Course for well over a year without completing it, we are going to impose a time limit of **one year** to complete the course. One year after starting the course, if you have not finished, you will be locked out of it and have to start over. The time limit will take effect on 1 July 2017.

Time limit on the IO Course. The same time limit will apply to the Investigating Officer (IO) Course with the same effective date.



Upcoming Inspector General Training

April 2017

RMR IG Senior Course - Salt Lake City, UT 21-22 April – contact Maj Kevin Forbes at kevin.forbes@slc.gov

GLR IG Senior Course – Mansfield, OH 22-23 April – contact Col Jay Burrell at jayburrell@comcast.net

PCR IG Senior Course - Reno, NV 27-28 April - contact Lt Col Preston Perrenot at pperrenot@cap.gov

SER IG Senior Course – Lake Buena Vista, FL 27-28 April – contact Lt Col Larry Julian at larry.julian@gawg.cap.gov

June 2017

SER IG Senior Course - Peachtree City, GA 1-2 June - contact Lt Col Larry Julian at larry.julian@gawg.cap.gov

August 2017

SWR IG Senior Course at the CAP National Conference, San Antonio, TX 30-31 August - contact Lt Col Les Manser at igt@cap.gov

What to do if you want to host an IGSC:

1. **Measure Interest:** 12-20 students
2. **Plan When:** Adjacent to, but not during, a Wing/Region Conference
3. **Plan Where:** Wi-Fi, Power for Computers, Projector, Desks or Tables
4. **Contact** the CAP/IGT (igt@cap.gov) to get an instructor and schedule the class
5. **Write** a “Promotion Piece” (Flyer) for the class
6. **Recruit** students (20 max)





Upcoming Compliance Inspections

WING	CI DATES	CYCLE/INSP#
SD	29-30 Apr 17	5-4
NM	6-7 May 17	5-5
TN	10-11 Jun 17	5-6
ME	15-16 July 17	5-7

IG Audience/LMS-IG Points of Contact

SEND ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS FOR THE IG AUDIENCE DIRECTLY TO LT COL LES MANSER at igt@cap.gov

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 DIRECTOR FOR IG COURSES IS LT COL DON BARBALACE at sdig.cap@gmail.com