



# CIVIL AIR PATROL INSPECTOR GENERAL IG AUDIENCE

Volume 10 Issue 1

January 2019

**FORWARD THIS TO ALL UNITS IN YOUR WING!**



**From Col Cheryl Fielitz-Scarborough, CAP/IG:**

**The information found in the IG Audience “fine tunes” what is covered in our regulations and adds clarity.**

**I encourage all our membership to read each issue of the IG Audience so they are better prepared for upcoming inspections or to help resolve conflicts.**

The IG Corps is busy with CAPR 20 series updates and hope to have all three completed by early spring. It is important that all members review the new regulations when they are posted to ensure you are up to date with the latest IG processes.

In the October 2018 edition of the IG Audience, I mentioned changes to the CI Grading. This is being fine-tuned and hopefully implemented in the very near future. Any commander can utilize the inspection worksheets at any time to check on the status of his/her unit or wing. Using the worksheets doesn't have to be initiated by an IG; remember, this is a commander's program. If you have inspection questions at any time, please contact your wing IG.

Another item mentioned was Continuous Compliance (CC). There MUST be objective monitoring to verify compliance. The purpose for moving toward CC is to provide commanders with more frequent visibility on compliance so they can take necessary action as early as possible by identifying and managing risks. There will still be “Boots on the Ground” every four years and continue to follow the current CI Schedule.

We are very excited about Continuous Compliance and how it will help the organization move forward. It will improve the inspection process as well as give commanders near real time information regarding their units. It will be very IT intensive and will have approvals from OPRs that will improve the quality of the data being inspected.

The other half of compliance deals with Complaint Resolution (CR). This is very seldom looked at as compliance - but in reality - complaints result from allegations of violation of regulations. We have updated the templates used in the CR process as well as changed the training that takes place. The updates in the IG coursework will entail a new course in LMS as well as a change in curriculum for both the IG Senior Course and IG College. With these changes, we hope to improve upon the methods & procedures used by IGs at all levels. This will also aid the commanders and members in understanding their responsibilities regarding CR.

## ***A Complaint Analysis – Part II***

*by Lt Col Preston Perrenot, CAP/IGQ*

This is the "answer" to the complaint analysis article from the October 2018 issue of the IG Audience. As you will recall, our original complaint went something like this:

I am Maj. Jim Dude and I am filing this complaint for the following reasons: My squadron commander, Lt. Col. Doe has never liked me and has always tried to pressure me to step out of my position as the squadron operations officer so that he can give the job to Maj. Citizen. I have a Master rating in operations and have been in the position for five years with no problems. Maj. Citizen has only been in our squadron for six months and only has a Technician Rating in operations. On August 9, 2018, I received an email from Lt. Col. Doe stating that I had been replaced as the operations officer by Maj. Citizen and thanking me for my service. He never told me why or what I had done wrong, just said that he wanted to give someone else a chance. Lt. Col. Doe is a poor commander and lacks the leadership skills necessary to lead this unit.



The first step in framing an allegation is finding it. It is obvious that there is not a lot of love and harmony between these two, but "my commander doesn't like me" is not enough by itself. We need to find an action that the commander took that may or may not be in furtherance of his personal feelings. In this case, that action is the complainant's removal from his position. In other words, an accusation. For those of you who have been to IG training classes, this is called "peeling the onion." Now, we just condense the allegation into one or two sentence statement that identifies who did what to whom, and when.

**On 9 August 2018, Lt. Col. Doe improperly removed Maj. Dude from his position as squadron Operations Officer.**

The word "improperly" makes this an allegation of wrong-doing. So, now we need to see what the regulations say. If you break this allegation down, we see that the complainant believes that his commander did something he was not allowed to do; so – from his view - the commander acted outside the scope of his authority.

CAPR 20-2 defines undesirable conduct and one of those definitions is Abuse of Authority. But it doesn't explicitly say that Abuse of Authority is a violation of the regulations - so what now? We make Abuse of Authority a violation of regulations by tying it into one of the reasons to terminate CAP membership (or issue an adverse member action) in CAPR 35-3. In this case, Conduct Unbecoming a Member of CAP will apply. So, what does it look like?

REGULATION VIOLATED	NUMBER & PARAGRAPH
CONDUCT UNBECOMING A MEMBER OF CAP, To Wit: ABUSE OF AUTHORITY	CAPR 35-3, para 4b(2)

As you can see, it is not necessary to put the definition of Abuse of Authority in the regulation violated area. In this case, Abuse of Authority is the reference, not the violation. You will get to define Abuse of Authority later.

Now, onto the analysis. You have framed the allegation and determined the specific regulations that were violated so now you put it together, entering all of that research you did into the regulations. The first part is where you define the Abuse of Authority. Just cut and paste the definition out of the regulation. The second part is where you paraphrase the complainant's statement and the third part is where you apply the regulations that you examined. Again, cutting and pasting is a great idea here.

**(1st PART)** CAPR 20-2, Appendix 2 defines Abuse of Authority as "A capricious exercise of power by a CAP member that adversely affects the privileges of membership and results in personal gain or advantage to himself or herself."

CAPR 20-1(i) identifies one of the duties of a squadron commander as "Select personnel to fill authorized staff positions and remove from staff position those members deemed unqualified or otherwise unsuitable to continue in their positions."

**(2nd PART)** The complainant stated that he was improperly removed from his position because the subject never told him what he did wrong to be removed. The complainant believes that this is a capricious exercise of power by the subject.

**(3rd PART)** The regulations do not state any requirement that a position is guaranteed or that there must be a stated reason for removal from that position, indicating that all personnel serve at the pleasure of the commander. This means that they may be removed or replaced at will. The complainant did not indicate that there was any disciplinary action or unfavorable information related to this personnel action so the subject was acting within his scope of authority. No violation of regulations occurred.

The conclusion that this allegation does not violate the regulations is based on what the regulations state compared to what the complainant said. The IG's opinion does not appear anywhere in this analysis.

So - how did you do?



## ***Inspection Regulation Changes***

*by Lt Col Craig Gallagher, CAP/IGI*

As a preface, the revised CAPR 20-3 is not published as of this writing. The revised regulation was put out to all the region commanders, selected NHQ staff and OPRs in November for review and comments. All the comments suggesting changes have been reviewed and either accepted, rejected or implemented in a revised way. The current version has been presented to John Salvador, CAP/COO, for final review before submitting it to CAP/CC and CAP-USAF/CC for approval to publish.

- **Tougher Grading for CIs and SUIs**

- Grading standards were set intentionally low when the current inspection methodology was introduced. Now that it has been up and running for four years, the new standards are a step closer to where we want CAP to be.
- Overall: To get an Effective grade, at least 80% instead of the former 75% of the graded Tabs must be Effective.
- Tabs: To get an Effective grade on a Tab, at least 60% instead of the former over-50% of the questions must be answered "Yes" or "N/A".
- Repeat discrepancies in a Tab will increase the percentage required to at least 70% whereas the current version of CAPR 20-3 specifies no special calculation based on repeat discrepancies.

- **Group SUIs Optional**

- Groups, like Flights, may be inspected or not at the discretion of the Wing Commander. Groups have varying uses, depending on the wing. Some use them only as a geographic operations function. Others use them as a single person unit to stand in for the Wing Commander for events that are inconvenient. Some even use them as they were intended in CAPR 20-1(i) i.e. to operate like a mini-wing.
- If inspected, the Wing Commander can choose which Tabs get inspected and which Tabs don't get inspected. If your wing functions as a one-man Group, it doesn't make sense to inspect them using every SUI Tab.

- **Reduced Time To Close Discrepancies**

- For CIs, the 14 month timespan for closing discrepancies has been reduced to 10 months.
- For SUIs, the 6 month timespan for closing discrepancies has been reduced to 5 months.
- We have been inspecting squadrons every two years since July 2014 and wings every 4 years since January 2014. It has always been an open-book test where you get to see all the questions well ahead of time.

- **Management-Level Assessments (MLAs)**

- A Management-Level Assessment is an attempt to gather information from Region and NHQ management level members that identifies what is going well, what is not and the reasons why. Especially for the things that are not going well, suggestions as to how they could be improved (more money, less busywork, more staff, more/better equipment, etc). It is intended to be a report to the next level manager (Commander) that is a thorough review by the OPR of his/her area of responsibility (AOR). Much like a self-assessment with suggestions as to how the AOR can be more effective.
- National Headquarters and each region will have periodic MLAs which will be used to assess the greatest needs and shortcomings.

### ***Feeling Bad About Your Last Compliance Inspection?***

*by Col Ed Burns, CAP/IGTA*

As a member of CAP's Compliance Inspection (CI) Team I appreciate the amount of effort that the wings put into their preparations for a CI. A large amount of data needs to be assembled (and hopefully carefully reviewed) prior to uploading into eServices. Even with all that we find discrepancies being assessed by the inspectors. The data that is available to the wing is the same data that the inspectors utilize before, during and after interviews are conducted. Perhaps it is no more than an issue of focusing on what is being asked in the worksheets. In reality you are being asked to participate in an open book test and we are even providing the answers for you in advance! If you find something that is broken, there is even an Inspection KnowledgeBase that tells you how to fix it in order to be compliant (see: <https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/inspection-knowledge-base>).



I realize that in a span of four years between CIs a lot has happened at the wing level; most notably, a change in command. But do you have to wait four years to prepare for a CI? On the surface, as the inspectors begin to look at a wing's programs after the in-brief, they inevitably find wing directors having 0-6 months of experience. That just sends up a warning flag. What did the original directors do over the course of 4 years? Why wasn't it caught earlier and fixed? Sometimes prepping for the CI is just something that is not a priority until the wing receives its 90-day notification letter and then it is usually too late to make the turnaround.

The concept of Continuous Compliance is being pushed forward to better ensure that the organization as a whole is always in compliance as defined by the regulations. A major benefit will be the reduction in the need to gather and upload data that is already available in eServices. For example, when a wing uploads its Annual Plan Of Action (POA) for Aerospace Education by the date required, it will not be necessary to re-upload for the CI. The wing will know each year if it is in compliance. If the POA is missed in one year it will be up to the wing to make sure that it does not miss another in ensuing years through a change in its management practices.

In conclusion, a wing's performance in its CI is totally dependent upon the amount of effort spent over a four-year period by the unit in preparation for that event. This same philosophy can be carried to Subordinate Unit Inspections as well.





## ***Wing IG Program Submissions and Region IG Review/Reporting***

by Lt Col Les Manser, CAP/IGT

As the IG program evolves, opportunities arise to ensure that IG activities become closed-loop processes for continuous improvement (a la Plan-Do-Check-Act – PDCA) as well as for continuous compliance. Annual activities included in CAPR 20-1 to support this were (1) wing-level Plan of Action (PoA) submissions to the Region IG (2) region-level review and reporting to the Region Commander and (3) Region Commander IG Program review.

CAPR 20-1 para 7.4 states:

“Wing IGs will complete an Annual SUI Plan of Action (PoA) which includes IG staff training and education and submit it to the Region IGs for review by 15 Dec as a way ahead for the coming year.”

(NOTE” In the next revision of CAPR 20-1, the reference to the PoA being SUI-specific will disappear. The PoA will encompass the whole wing IG program. This will ensure that it is aligned with what the Region IGs review and subsequently report to their commanders.)

The requirement for a Wing SUI PoA has been in place for over 4 years; however, nothing was formally stated regarding WHO saw this plan and WHERE it was it located for access/review. As a result, PoAs sometimes became a “fill-the-square” event and were not used/implemented = no added value. No more.

The purpose of the plan was always to specify HOW the program was managed by the Wing IG and WHAT specific training and education activities (beyond the required LMS courses) were provided to Wing IGAs (staff) and – if necessary – SUI Team Chiefs and Inspection Augmentees.

The intent of the plan is for it to be the starting point for executing the program. Once PLAN and DO is accomplished, then the expectation is that the Wing IGs perform a CHECK on how the IG activities went (good or not-so-good) and then perform the ACT (actions) necessary to improve the program. An outcome of this activity would be to revise the plan as required to implement the improvements. Doing this on an annual basis was deemed by the CAP/IG to be frequent enough for the PDCA cycle.

The submission of plans on an annual basis now give the region IGs visibility on each wing’s program; and, along with the IG-related data in eServices and ECIM, are able to directly assess each wing programs’ strengths, weaknesses and opportunities for improvement. As a result, the Region IGs are in a position to assist/support Wing IGs more effectively.

CAPR 20-1 para 7.3 states:

“Region IGs will conduct and document an Annual Review of subordinate wing IG programs showing trends and Electronic Case Information Management (ECIM) status and submit to their Region Commander by 15 Jan of each year.”

The reviews will now give the Region Commander visibility on the “health” of each wings’ IG program along with any Region IG concerns. As a result, appropriate and timely region-level command action can be taken to maintain program strengths, remedy program weaknesses and support efforts to accomplish program improvements.



### **IG SENIOR COURSE (IGSC) CURRICULUM CHANGES**

The IGSC curriculum is currently being updated to expand on the Complaint Analysis portion of the Complaints Resolution process. The updated courseware should be completed in the next week and is planned to be implemented in time for the SER IGSC scheduled at the end of January.

### **CAPR 20-3 REVISION**

The implementation of changes to the inspection regulation has been completed and it is currently being reviewed by the CAP/COO. It will then go through the approval process with the CAP/CC and the CAP-USAF/CC. It is expected that the revised regulation will be published in February 2019.



## ***Upcoming Inspector General Training***

### **January 2019**

SER IG Senior Course at FLWG Headquarters, Lakeland Linder Airport, Lakeland, FL on 26-27 January – contact Maj Sam Chiodo, FLWG/IG, at [schiodo@flwg.gov](mailto:schiodo@flwg.gov) or call 813-748-4139.

### **March 2019**

GLR IG Senior Course at Southeast Michigan Group Headquarters, Willow Run Airport, Ypsilanti, MI on 30-31 March – contact Lt Col Michael Fultz, MIWG/IG, at [mfultz@cap.gov](mailto:mfultz@cap.gov) or call 586-201-8147.

### **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](mailto:igt@cap.gov)) to get an IGSC Instructor and schedule the class
5. **Write** a class “Promotion Piece” (Flyer) for region/wing distribution
6. **Recruit** students (20 max)







## *Upcoming Compliance Inspections*

WING	CI DATES	CYCLE/INSP#
KY	19-20 Jan 19	5-26
MD	16-17 Feb 19	5-27
WV	9-10 Mar 19	5-28
IA	6-7 Apr 19	5-29

## *IG Audience/LMS-IG Points of Contact*

SEND **ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS** FOR THE IG AUDIENCE DIRECTLY TO LT COL LES MANSER at [igt@cap.gov](mailto:igt@cap.gov)

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



**LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS COORDINATOR** FOR IG COURSES IS COL ED BURNS at [eburns@cap.gov](mailto:eburns@cap.gov)

Contact Col Burns if you notice any discrepancies/issues with the IG course materials in LMS.