



# CIVIL AIR PATROL INSPECTOR GENERAL IG AUDIENCE

Volume 6 Issue 4

October 2015

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

**A note from Col Tom Kettell, 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 IG) will be a contributing element towards moving CAP in the direction of continuous improvement and the establishment of a quality culture.



## ***Selecting a New IG College Site***

*by Lt Col Craig Gallagher, CAP/IGT*

After the 2014 IG College surveys were tabulated, it became clear that some changes needed to be made. One of the changes was the location: We needed to satisfy the following requirements:

1. The location needed to be easily accessible from anywhere in the country;
2. The hotel expense needed to be reasonable and compatible for teaching;
3. There must easily accessible eating facilities;
4. The facility needed to have high-speed WiFi available for the group presentations; and

5. The facility needed to be able to accommodate up to 50 students and 12 staff.

### **The location needed to be easily accessible from anywhere in the country**

We set the parameters that the location needed to be near a major hub airport that was not on the east or west coast – that narrowed down the choices to Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas or Denver. All are in major metropolitan areas with lots of hotels that have meeting facilities.

### **The hotel expense needed to be reasonable and compatible for teaching**

Shopping for price came after determining the facilities that could accommodate presentations for at least 50 students at a time and have at least five breakout rooms that could hold an instructor and 10 students. After narrowing down the capable facilities, we then shopped for price.



### **There must easily accessible eating facilities**

Metropolitan areas are full of restaurants!

### **The facility needed to have high-speed WiFi available for the group presentations**

The facility needed to provide WiFi at a reasonable cost (free!)

### **The facility needed to be able to accommodate up to 50 students and 12 staff**

This ended up not being a problem. All the facilities that met the first four requirements met this one easily.

Our IGC Logistics Director, Lt Col Les Manser, put out articles in the IG Audience for suggestions, sought help from CAP folks that were in the hotel business and help from NHQ folks that had experience putting on large get-togethers like National Conferences. We were able to negotiate a contract with the Dolce Atlanta-Peachtree Hotel and Conference Center in Peachtree City, just south of Atlanta. This facility has been used for other CAP events like the recent Southeast Region Conference.

The college is scheduled for June 13-17 2016. It is expected that the students will travel to arrive on June 12<sup>th</sup> and depart on June 18<sup>th</sup>. Classes will be in session from 8am to 5pm, Monday through Friday. Attendees are required to have completed the Inspector General Senior Course before arriving. Naturally, Wing IGs are required to attend the first college after receiving their duty assignment as IG. IGAs are also encouraged to attend along with Region/Wing Commanders and Vice Wing Commanders.

### **Highlights**

1. The facility is the Dolce Atlanta-Peachtree just 25 minutes south of Atlanta. This facility was built as a large corporate training center and should serve our needs magnificently. You can find out more by going online and looking up [www.dolceatlantapeachtree.com](http://www.dolceatlantapeachtree.com).
2. The cost to attend will be travel expense and meals; some of you may be able to get help from your wing for these expenses. NHQ will bear the expenses for rooms, meeting places and staff.
3. Meals at the facility cost \$14.95 for breakfast, 17.95 for lunch and 29.95 for dinner plus 6% tax and a 22% service charge – these are current prices and may change.
4. We are planning to have the Georgia Wing provide CAP Van transportation to and from the airport.

## ***Confusion Over the IG Refresher Course***

*by Lt Col Don Barbalace, CAP/IGTA*

So, you took 2 or 3 of the refresher “courses” this year and printed the certificates, but then you didn’t get the credit on your training record in eServices. Now you are confused. Why doesn’t it show in eServices?

The answer is simple. The annual refresher course is actually four (4) installments of the IG Audience and a quiz on each. You didn’t take all four because only 3 had been published. With this issue, now all four are available. When you complete all of them, you will get 2015 refresher credit in eServices and will be “current” for all of 2016. Until then, you have the satisfaction of being up to date and knowing all the latest information on the IG program.

Caution: You must complete all four by the end of December. They disappear at the beginning of 2016, to be replaced by a new set of 4 installments.



Who is required to take the refresher course? Strictly speaking, no one is required to take it. This is the wrong question to ask. The right question is “Who is required to be current in the IG Program?” The answer is all appointed IGs. That means all Wing, Region and National HQ IGs and their appointed assistants (CAPR 123-1 para 10e). Inspection Augmentees (IA) are not IGs, so they are not included. An IA *augments* the work of the IG or IGA, and is required to be current in inspection requirements, but is not an IG and thus is not required to accomplish annual refresher training. An IA is not even required to be enrolled in the IG Specialty Track.

There are several ways to obtain refresher credit. Taking all 4 parts of the IG Audience course is one way. Other ways, specified in CAPR 123-1 include:

- A briefing or workshop by the next higher-level IG (Must be approved by IGT.)
- Completion of any IG course (IA, IO, IGSC, IGC)
- Serving as an Instructor or assistant in teaching any IG Course

Suppose you have a Compliance Inspection (CI) in 2015. Will you, as Wing IG, get a discrepancy because you or your assistant(s) did not complete the refresher training in 2015? No, you should not, PROVIDED you have annual refresher credit for 2014. That credit is good for all of 2015. Next year, you must show 2015 credit. Every year you must show that you had a refresher in the previous year.



## ***Plans of Action for Discrepancy Closure***

*by Col Steve Miller, CAP/IGI*

CAP members still have questions regarding “Plans of Action” (POA) that are required to close some discrepancies. The CAP/IG Inspection Knowledgebase includes everything a wing or unit must do to close a discrepancy. In some cases, a POA is required. This article will go over plans of action, what should be included in them, and other miscellaneous information regarding them.

First, why do we need them? They were never required before. In the past when a wing or unit had a discrepancy, in many cases, there was confusion on how to close it. For instance, the wing or subordinate unit received a discrepancy for not conducting Required Staff Training (RST) IAW CAP regulations.

The confusion was caused because the event(s) had already occurred. It’s tough to give the training after the fact. If no event requiring RST is scheduled for the next 14 months for a wing or 6 months for a subordinate unit, the wing or unit can’t close out the discrepancy and then has a major problem.

Submitting a POA, outlining what the wing or subordinate unit will do to ensure the discrepancy doesn’t reoccur, gives the wing or subordinate unit a relatively easy way to close the discrepancy. Any member may write a POA but it must be approved (signed) by the Wing or Subordinate Unit Commander, as applicable. Typically wing plans of action are written by the OPR or the IG. Subordinate unit plans of action are usually written by the OPR or Commander. The key is that the commander must approve the POA. Approval typically is his/her signature on the document.

A POA should not be a policy letter stating a specific regulation will be followed. A POA should include some or all of the following:

- 1) What the problem was as listed in the discrepancy
- 2) A detailed examination of what caused the problem (root cause analysis)
- 3) What is being done to ensure the problem doesn't reoccur
  - a. Some suggested measures to ensure the problem doesn't reoccur
    - i. Accomplish staff training
    - ii. Change staff when necessary
    - iii. Develop a calendar for important events
    - iv. Implement a "tickler system" that reminds staff personnel of deadlines
    - v. Develop a backup process (oversight)
    - vi. Create S.M.A.R.T. goals to ensure the problem doesn't reoccur
      1. S – Specific
      2. M – Measurable
      3. A – Attainable
      4. R – Realistic
      5. T – Timely

More information follows regarding the S.M.A.R.T. goals system.

**Specific** - A specific goal has a much greater chance of being accomplished than a general goal. To set a specific goal you must answer the six "W" questions:

- \* Who: Who is involved?
- \* What: What do I want to accomplish?
- \* Where: Identify a location.
- \* When: Establish a time frame.
- \* Which: Identify requirements and constraints.
- \* Why: Specific reasons, purpose or benefits of accomplishing the goal.

EXAMPLE: A general goal would be "Get in shape." But a specific goal would be "Join a health club and workout 3 days a week."

---

**Measurable** - Establish concrete criteria for measuring progress toward the attainment of each goal you set.

When you measure your progress, you stay on track, reach your target dates and experience the exhilaration of achievement that spurs you on to continued effort required to reach your goal.

To determine if your goal is measurable, ask questions such as:

- \* How much? How many?
- \* How will I know when it is accomplished?

---

**Attainable** - When you identify goals that are most important to you, you begin to figure out ways you can make them come true. You develop the attitudes, abilities, skills, and financial capacity to reach them. You begin seeing previously overlooked opportunities to bring yourself closer to the achievement of your goals.

You can attain most any goal you set when you plan your steps wisely and establish a time frame that allows you to carry out those steps. Goals that may have seemed far away and out of reach eventually move closer and become attainable, not because your goals shrink, but because you grow and expand to match them. When you list your goals you build your self-image. You see yourself as worthy of these goals, and develop the traits and personality that allow you to possess them.

---

**Realistic** - To be realistic, a goal must represent an objective toward which you are both willing and able to work. A goal can be both high and realistic; you are the only one who can decide just how high your goal should be. But be sure that every goal represents substantial progress. A high goal is frequently easier to reach than a low one because a low goal exerts low motivational force. Some of the hardest jobs you ever accomplished actually seem easy simply because they were a labor of love.

---

**Timely** - A goal should be grounded within a time frame. With no time frame tied to it there's no sense of urgency. If you want to lose 10 lbs., when do you want to lose it by? "Someday" won't work. But if you anchor it within a timeframe, "by May 1st", then you've set your unconscious mind into motion to begin working on the goal.

Your goal is probably realistic if you truly *believe* that it can be accomplished. Additional ways to know if your goal is realistic is to determine if you have accomplished anything similar in the past or ask yourself what conditions would have to exist to accomplish this goal.

You will find a very easy-to-use POA template on the Inspector General web site under the COMPLIANCE INSPECTION INFORMATION link.

[http://www.capmembers.com/cap\\_national\\_hq/inspector\\_general/inspection-checklist/](http://www.capmembers.com/cap_national_hq/inspector_general/inspection-checklist/)

## ***Changing the "Fill the Square" Mentality in Compliance***

by Lt Col Les Manser, CAP/IGTA

There are many roadblocks that can impede the progress of continuous improvement in compliance and mission effectiveness. Tools/concepts that IGs, Commanders and their Unit Staff can use to dismantle some of these roadblocks have already been addressed in previous journal articles - examples: Plan-Do-Check-Act, Best Practices and the 5 WHYS for Problem Solving.

However, there are certain roadblocks that can severely impede these continuous improvement efforts because they are cultural in nature – and unless they are eventually eliminated - will continue to hinder the overall progress towards implementing a quality culture in CAP. One of these cultural roadblocks is the "fill the square" mentality. Sadly, this cultural roadblock is not unique to CAP – but nonetheless needs to be addressed in all mission areas/functions – starting with compliance efforts.

The purpose of this article is not an attempt to "solve world hunger". Changing even a single cultural characteristic in an organization takes years – sometimes decades – so what can IGs and their Commanders do now to start dismantling this roadblock in the area of compliance? Answer: Make it your personal/professional goal to ensure that ALL of the time spent by the volunteers in your organization supporting compliance is "quality" time, freeing up the rest of their time to be applied to accomplishing the missions of CAP.

One of the main challenges in any volunteer organization is the constraint of time on its individuals. There is only so much volunteer time that an individual chooses to commit to an endeavor. Depending on the organizational environment, this time is either smartly/efficiently spent or foolishly/inefficiently spent (or a combination of both). No CAP member wants to volunteer for the purpose of serving their community and then realize that they are wasting their time or "spinning their wheels" – this is called non-quality time.



What are the indicators of non-quality time? For the area of compliance, here's a short but representative list based on CI/SUIs SAVs and Survey Audits discrepancy responses (slightly re-phrased for learning emphasis) and the common causes of this non-quality time:

- “We’ll start over/replace the person” = rework; lack of continuity and/or mentoring; sub-standard Professional Development specialty track training for the individual in that duty position.
- “We’ll [only] correct the discrepancy [that the Inspector identified]” = lack of responsibility/ownership to get to the real cause(s) of the problem by the OPR; not aware/misunderstanding of compliance items in applicable regulations.
- “We’ll do it right/follow the regulations from now on” – the classic “gunnadoo”; problem not addressed at all by the OPR.

Many times the underlying message that comes across in a discrepancy response seems to be “There – we did what you asked us to do – now close the discrepancy and leave us alone!!” Leave you alone to do what? Re-invent the wheel and/or repeat the same discrepancy again during the next 2-4 years and waste more of the volunteers’ time? That’s not improvement – but it is indicative of the fill-the-square mentality.

What are the causes of the fill-the-square mentality? It usually evolves/surfaces due to some type of limitation/factor or combination of limitations/factors that you will want to recognize:

- Time – the most critical factor; the more limited the time, the more opportunity that short cuts or elimination of process steps involving compliance may be taken. Delaying problem resolution then becomes the inadvertent consequence of limited time.
- “Closure-itis” - taking only the minimum action necessary to close a discrepancy quickly – as if it’s an unexpected crisis. This usually results in a problem that continues to exist (remember that the discrepancy is just a symptom of the problem – not the problem itself), a problem that is not prevented from re-occurring, is ignored over time, and/or is “pushed out” for another 2-4 years until a discrepancy related to the problem is issued again (REPEAT) during the next inspection.
- Ignorance - no awareness that the things that make up the fill-the-square culture/condition – rework, wasted time, workarounds, short cuts, ignoring the problem, etc. - is the organization’s “norm”.
- Resignation – not doing anything about it; “that’s the way it’s always been done around here”.
- Leadership – condoning or supporting this cultural condition in their organization; no timely and/or effective command action taken.

Countering the fill-the-square mentality after its recognition is a matter of taking timely and effective action at all applicable levels that is consistent and relentless over time. This will result in converting non-quality time into quality time for volunteers.

- Don’t apply short time limits when it comes to accomplishing cause analysis and problem solving. Take the time necessary to correct and then prevent problems from recurring.
- Don’t be in a rush to close discrepancies just for the sake of closure. First, understand the difference between symptoms and problems. Then verify that the implemented corrective/preventive actions for the problem are effective. If not effective, why not? Re-evaluate the facts, causes and actions.
- Don’t accept/tolerate the “status quo” in your organization. Be the “change agent” and lead the way to improved mission/functional performance.

Keep in mind that the “How to Clear” information provided by CAP/IG in the Inspection Knowledgebase IG web page should not be interpreted as square filling actions. This information is provided to promote the understanding of the minimum actions needing to be accomplished for discrepancy closure – but this doesn’t necessarily mean that it’s the only action that should be taken to resolve a problem. And although the item “Attach a plan of action, approved by Unit/CC, to prevent reoccurrence to the discrepancy in the DTS.” is not listed for all discrepancies, IGs should challenge their Commanders to properly accomplish this anyway and even offer to facilitate the problem solving process with the Commander and/or Commander’s Staff.

Under the “Work Smarter, not Harder” Department: Remember that it takes far less time to “do it right the first time” (quality time) versus the typical 10X time and resources needed to re-accomplish it correctly - and then additionally - implement a solution for each process breakdown that led to the discrepancy (rework; non-quality time). The choice is yours – it’s a “pay me now or pay me later” situation.

As leaders, start the cultural change with your new members, building on what they learned in Level 1 regarding Core Values - and specifically - Excellence: “In saving lives and shaping lives, CAP members commit themselves to a level of performance and achievement reflecting our vital work, to never settle for “good enough.” The things we do and the technologies we use – during the meetings, during our missions, even while studying at home – **require our continual effort to improve.**”



### ***What is the Ideal Complaint Analysis?***

*by Col Gordon Odell, SER/JA, SER/IGA*

*A review of complaint analyses reveals a tremendous range in their quality. It begs the question addressed here: What is in the ideal Complaint Analysis? The reader is encouraged to review the following with care: CAPR 123-1 ¶¶1.a-g, 3a-c (1-3) &(5) and CAPR 123-2 ¶¶1.d. and 8.e(1) & (2).*

**What is the purpose of a complaint analysis?** Complaints are one method of bringing command attention to a problem. The complaint analysis (CA) “is a preliminary review [analysis] of assertions and evidence to determine the potential validity and relevance of the issues to CAP and to *determine what action is necessary within IG, supervisory or other channels*”

Complaints are routed through the Inspector General (IG) because the IG serves as the commander’s “sensor,” to alert the commander (CC) to concerns and problems that “may reveal systemic, morale or other problems that impede efficiency and organizational effectiveness.”

An *adequate* CA analyzes information at hand (including clarification with the complainant), determines a resolution path and documents the determination process.

The *ideal* CA provides information, analysis, and advice to the CC so as to advance the complaint resolution process as far as practical.

**So how is the ideal CA to be used?** The CA is both an analysis and the documentation of the analysis. It the IG's *staff work* that provides the justification for the choice of resolution

strategy. CC uses the CA to confirm that the IG's choice of resolution method for each individual assertion raised in the complaint is appropriate. Resolution strategies (identified in *italics* below) are but a part of the IG's options:

- a. *Dismiss* entirely,
- b. *Refer* to CC or recommend referral elsewhere,
- c. Approve *transfer* to another IG
- d. Provide *assistance* to complainant through the IG,
- e. *Investigate* through appointment by the commander of an investigator,

The CA also serves to inform the CC regarding the status and circumstances under his/her command.

**The ideal CA doesn't end with identifying a resolution strategy.**

By documenting the rationale behind the choice of resolution, the CA helps to ensure "the existence of a responsive complaint resolution" program.

The ideal CA recognizes and addresses each concern expressed in the complaint in the course of the analysis. In so doing, the CA helps the commander (with the assistance of the IG or the legal officer) to prepare the necessary correspondence, such as close-out letters that the matter is being handled.

When an assertion is referred to command or elsewhere, the CA explains why the assertion is not an IG matter and is best addressed by the office to which it would be referred, such as the commander. When referring an assertion to command, the CA discusses what resolution paths command may consider, what work needs to be done, and why. It does *not* suggest corrective action.

If there is an investigation, the CA sets the course by framing the issues in the format of who, did what, to whom, when, where, and in violation of what directive? (Frame the issue separately for each directive.) This format shows what facts must be established to substantiate the complaint.

**Complaint analyses are necessary.** They ascertain and justify the appropriate resolution path which would ultimately close the matter. The ideal complaint analysis goes further and aids CC in resolving complaints referred to command and explaining options chosen.

## ***Upcoming IG Training***

### **OCTOBER 2015**



GLR IG Senior Course at Ohio Wing Conference, Mansfield Lahm AFB, OH  
October 24-25 2015 – contact Jay Burrell at [jayburrell@comcast.net](mailto:jayburrell@comcast.net)

### **NOVEMBER 2015**



NER IG Senior Course at Camp Niantic Regional Training Institute, Niantic, CT  
November 7-8 2015 – contact Don Blumenfeld at [donblume@optonline.net](mailto:donblume@optonline.net)

Contact Missie Derocher-Harris, IG Support Coordinator at NHQ, [mderocher-harris@capnhq.gov](mailto:mderocher-harris@capnhq.gov) to enroll.

### **What to do if you want to host an IGSC:**

1. **Measure Interest:** 12-20 students
2. **Plan When:** Adjacent to, but not during Wing and Region Conferences is often convenient for travel and expenses.
3. **Plan Where:** Wi-Fi, Power for Computers, Projector, Desks or Tables
4. **Contact** the IGT ([eaacraig@gmail.com](mailto:eaacraig@gmail.com)) to get an instructor and schedule the class
5. **Write** a “Promotion Piece” for the class and distribute it to the entire region.
6. **Recruit** students (20 max)

## ***Upcoming Compliance Inspections***

WING	CI DATES	CYCLE/INSP#
OH	7-8 Nov 15	4-36
OK	12-13 Dec 15	4-37
CA	9-10 Jan 16	4-38

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

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