



CIVIL AIR PATROL INSPECTOR GENERAL IG AUDIENCE

Volume 10 Issue 4

October 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 has finished the required annual review of the regulations for the “20” series and these are posted on the website. There have been many changes and clarifications as to how the IG Corps measures and determines compliance. The IG Corps works independently and objectively to determine compliance through **both** complaint resolution and compliance inspections accomplished at

the wing and below wing levels. We encourage you to read through CAPR 20-2, and 20-3 to ensure you are up to date with the latest in the IG world.

We are very excited to announce the dates and location of the next Inspector General College (IGC). IGC will be held on McGhee Tyson Air National Guard Base in Knoxville, TN. The dates are 9-13 Sept 2020 with some of the course work done ahead of time using a combination of AXIS and webinars. This will allow us the much-needed time for “hands on” training while on site. Watch for more information coming soon regarding the priority list for sign up and “wait list”. All potential wing IGs are required by regulation to take this course prior to being assigned as the wing IG.

Reminder: The new online CAPF 20 simplifies the filing of a complaint and it can be found on the CAP website under Inspector General. See: <https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/complaints>. It is easier to use and documents get into the hands of the correct IG much quicker than the use of the paper form. The paper form is still available for use as well. Educate your members on the use of this e-form.

Answer to Complaint Analysis Exercise #2

by Lt Col Preston Perrenot, CAP/IGQ



This is the "answer" to the complaint analysis article from the July 2019 issue of the IG Audience. As you will recall, our original complaint was stated as:

My name is Cadet Joey Citizen and I attended the XXWG encampment last month. It was my first encampment in the CAP so I was having a hard time adjusting to the regimen. On the second day, I was in morning formation and we were at attention. Someone was talking to the formation, I think it was the encampment commander but I couldn't hear what she was saying so I leaned over and asked the cadet next to me what she had said. The other cadet didn't even have a chance to answer me because 1st Lt. Doe, one of the TAC officers came up and told me to come with him. He lead me behind the formation and very quietly, so no one else could hear him, told me that there is no talking or moving around while at the position of attention and that if I need to ask a question or need to move, I need to ask permission. I was terrified because no one has ever spoken to me like this before. I couldn't even speak! All I could do was stand at attention. There were other TAC officers there and I know that they saw what was happening but didn't do anything. 1st Lt. Doe asked me if I understood what he said and I answered "Yes sir." He told me to get back in formation. I think this is Hazing. Later, after lights out, I was sleeping and we were all awakened by Maj. Hardcase, the Commandant of Cadets, storming into our squad bay, turning on the lights and yelling for us to get up. He told us to put on our uniforms and stand at attention in front of our bunks. He then told us that two cadets in our flight, Cadets Skylark and Loser had been caught outside the barracks smoking cigarettes. Maj. Hardcase told us that these two cadets would be sent home and probably 2B'd. He also said that this was a unit failure and that we all failed. He said that someone should have known and that Cadets Skylark and Loser had left the barracks. I tried to point that it was after lights out and that we were all asleep, but Maj. Hardcase yelled at me, asking me when he told me to talk. Before I could answer, he came very close to me (in my face), and loudly told me to SHUT UP. Then he said because we all failed, we would stand at attention in front of our bunks until reveille to give us a chance to contemplate our failure. I looked at the clock and saw that it was 0530 and I knew that reveille was at 0700. After about twenty minutes, another TAC Officer, I don't know who, came in and pulled Maj. Hardcase aside for a private conversation. Maj. Hardcase then told us we could stand at ease, but no talking. We stood there quietly until 0700 then went out for morning formation. We didn't even have a chance to take a shower. Is this Abuse?

I "peeled the onion" and found four allegations against Maj Hardcase and one allegation against 1st Lt. Doe. Let's start with 1st Lt. Doe. This is the framed allegation:

ALLEGATION 3.1

On 21 May 2019, 1st Lt. Doe committed Hazing on Cadet Citizen by pulling him out of formation and admonishing him (Citizen) for talking and moving around while at the position of attention.

We may not think this is Hazing but analyze as Hazing anyway to be on the safe side. Remember to "tie in" one of the reasons to terminate CAP membership in CAPR 35-3.

REGULATION VIOLATED	NUMBER & PARAGRAPH
SERIOUS OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF CAP REGULATIONS, To Wit: HAZING	CAPR 35-3, para 4b(7)

ALLEGATION 3.1 ANALYSIS

Part 1: CAPR 60-2, para 1.5.4. defines Hazing as "any conduct whereby someone causes another person to suffer or to be exposed to any activity that is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. Questions of hazing often pertain to the intensity level of military-style training in Cadet Programs. Training intensity is

evaluated in context. For example, a training intensity that is too stern and demanding for a unit meeting may be appropriate at an encampment."

Part 2: 1st Lt. Doe removed Cadet Citizen from the formation and quietly corrected Cadet Citizen's behavior without physical contact.

Part 3: 1st Lt. Doe removed Cadet Citizen from the formation so the corrective action would not be in public. Additionally, he spoke softly so that he would not be overheard. The complainant stated that 1st Lt. Doe instructed him on the proper position of attention. The complainant did not state or indicate that 1st Lt. Doe was cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. This allegation does not violate the regulation and the recommendation is to DISMISS this allegation.

So, 1st Lt. Doe is off the hook. But is he? As an IG officer conducting a complaint analysis, you can analyze the allegation under a different regulation. And if you are a good IG officer, you will. If it's not hazing, is it a Cadet Protection Boundary Violation? This is how we find out.

ALLEGATION 3.2

1st Lt. Doe held a counselling session with Cadet Citizen without another senior member present	
REGULATION VIOLATED	NUMBER & PARAGRAPH
SERIOUS OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF CAP REGULATIONS, To Wit: VIOLATION OF CPPT STANDARDS OF PRACTICE	CAPR 35-3, para 4b(7)

Now, the analysis.

Part 1: CAPR 60-2, para 2.4.4. states: "Two-Deep Leadership. CAP's general policy is that every cadet activity must be supervised by at least two adult leaders who are in "Approved" status in eServices (see CAPR 39-2, Civil Air Patrol Membership). CPP training materials explain how that principle is put into practice." Violation of the "Two-Deep Leadership" rule is considered a "Boundary Violation."

Part 2: 1st Lt. did remove Cadet Citizen away from the formation and conducted one-on-one counselling session with Cadet Citizen. However, CAPR 60-2, para 2.4.6. states: "Semi-Private Discussions. Adult leaders who need to mentor or counsel cadets individually during official activities should do so in the presence of a third person when reasonably possible. Alternatively, one-on-one meetings are permitted if conducted in a semi-open setting (e.g. office door kept ajar, or conversing away from, but in sight of, the group, or other circumstances). Cadets are prohibited from meeting one-on-one in a closed environment; an adult leader must be present or other arrangements must be made to minimize the risk of misconduct, such as keeping the door fully open.

Part 3: Cadet Citizen's statement said that there were other TAC officers in immediate area and, in fact, Cadet Citizen indicated that they were watching the conversation between Cadet Citizen and 1st Lt. Doe. 1st Lt. Doe's actions do not violate the regulations and this allegation should be DISMISSED.

So, yes. 1st Lt. Does is still off the hook. Now, onto Maj. Hardcase.

Yes, I know about the sleep-time and personal hygiene requirements and that is coming. Remember what was said about analyzing each allegation separately.

ALLEGATION 4.1

On 21 May 2019, Maj. Hardcase committed Hazing on the cadets in Bravo Flight at the XXWG Encampment by forcing them to stand at attention in front of their bunks for an extended time period.	
REGULATION VIOLATED	NUMBER & PARAGRAPH
SERIOUS OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF CAP REGULATIONS, To Wit: HAZING	CAPR 35-3, para 4b(7)

ALLEGATION 4.1 ANALYSIS

Part 1: CAPR 60-2, para 1.5.4. defines Hazing as "any conduct whereby someone causes another person to suffer or to be exposed to any activity that is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. Questions of hazing often pertain to the intensity level of military-style training in Cadet Programs. Training intensity is evaluated in context. For example, a training intensity that is too stern and demanding for a unit meeting may be appropriate at an encampment."

Part 2: Maj. Hardcase woke the cadets up and forced them to stand in front of their bunks for an extended amount of time.

Part 3: Firstly, Maj. Hardcase's punishment of the entire flight for the actions of two cadets, while the rest were sleeping, has extremely questionable value as a corrective action and was unnecessary as the two delinquent cadets had been caught and dealt with. It appears that Maj. Hardcase had no evidence indicating that any of the other cadets in Bravo Flight were complicit in the actions of Cadets Skylark and Loser. The act of forcing the cadets to stand at attention or even at ease to "contemplate their failure" serves no purpose other than to humiliate and demean the cadets. If this allegation were proved to be true, it would violate CAP regulations. Recommend an INVESTIGATION to determine the veracity of the complainant's statements.

But Wait. There's more!

ALLEGATION 4.2

On 21 May 2019, Maj. Hardcase committed Hazing on Cadet Citizen at the XXWG Encampment by getting in his (Citizen's) face and shouting at him to shut up.

REGULATION VIOLATED	NUMBER & PARAGRAPH
SERIOUS OR WILLFUL VIOLATION OF CAP REGULATIONS, To Wit: HAZING	CAPR 35-3, para 4b(7)

ALLEGATION 4.2 ANALYSIS

Part 1: CAPR 60-2, para 1.5.4. defines Hazing as "any conduct whereby someone causes another person to suffer or to be exposed to any activity that is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful. Questions of hazing often pertain to the intensity level of military-style training in Cadet Programs. Training intensity is evaluated in context. For example, a training intensity that is too stern and demanding for a unit meeting may be appropriate at an encampment."

Part 2: Maj. Hardcase leaned into Cadet Citizen's personal space and yelled at him to shut up.

Part 3: It is unnecessary for an officer who has supervisory authority to display the fact that he is angry. If Cadet Citizen spoke out of turn, Maj. Hardcase had the authority to issue a disciplinary or corrective action. Getting into a subordinate's face and yelling at them only serves to display a lack of self-control on the part of the officer and erode confidence in the organizational leadership. There is no doubt that Maj. Hardcase's alleged public actions are abusive, humiliating, oppressive and demeaning. If this allegation is proved to be true, it would violate CAP regulations. Recommend an INVESTIGATION to determine the veracity of the complainant's statements.

There are two hazing allegations, one committed against Cadet Citizen and one committed against the entire flight which means that you will have to add a few more names to your victim list. That is why we analyze them separately.

Okay, now we can get into the sleep-time and Hygiene Issues.

ALLEGATION 4.3

On 21 May 2019, Maj. Hardcase intentionally deprived the cadets in the flight of the required sleep and personal hygiene time as required by Cadet Program regulations.

REGULATION VIOLATED	NUMBER & PARAGRAPH
---------------------	--------------------

ALLEGATION 4.3 ANALYSIS

Part 1: CAPR 60-1, para 9.3.5 states " Personal Needs. Encampments will provide every participant with three full, balanced meals daily. Students will be afforded the opportunity for 8.5 hours of uninterrupted sleep nightly, and the 30 minutes preceding lights out will be reserved for personal time. Cadet cadre will have an opportunity for 8.0 hours of uninterrupted sleep.

Part 2: The complainant stated that Maj. Hardcase woke the flight at approximately 0530 and that reveille was supposed to be at 0700, indicating that the cadets were roused one hour and a half early. Regarding the personal hygiene time, the regulation is clear in that personal hygiene time occurs one half an hour before lights out, not in the morning after reveille.

Part 3: In his original complaint, the complainant did not state what time lights out was but in the complaint clarification interview, he confirmed that lights out was at 2300 hours the night before. If this allegation were proved to be true, then Maj. Hardcase deprived the cadets of the eight hours of sleep required by the regulations. An INVESTIGATION is necessary to determine the veracity of the complainant's statements.

The Take-Aways:

- 1) If you think there is an allegation in there, analyze it. Try not to miss anything.
- 2) The complainant does not get to tell you what the allegations are. They are just telling you a story. You decide what the allegations are. We ask them on the complaint form what regulations they THINK were violated because we want to encourage them to read the regulations prior to filing the complaint.
- 3) Your job is to provide all of the information you can to the appointing authority so that the appointing authority can make the most informed decision possible.
- 4) You do not assign guilt or innocence. You simply determine if the subject's actions were in violation of the regulations. It's up to the appointing authority to determine if the subject's actions were justified or not.
- 5) Analyze each allegation separately. Even if two subjects did the same thing at the same time or one subject is alleged to have committed multiple violations of the same regulation.
- 6) A complaint analysis is not an investigation, so you are not trying to determine what really happened or whether or not everyone is telling the truth. You are just comparing the complainant's version of events with the regulations. Determining the truth comes later, IF you go to investigation.

“Knowledge is of
no value unless
you put it into
practice.”

Anton Chekhov

INSPECTIONS

Common Compliance Inspection for Sub-Unit Report Mistakes

By Lt Col Craig Gallagher, CAP/IGI



To avoid mistakes in producing an inspection report you should use the Quality Assurance (QA) checklist. The QA checklist is one of the documents included in “Zipped Team Documents” found on the IG SUI page in:

<https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/sui>.

One of the most common mistakes I see in the posted inspection reports is that they are not “flattened”, i.e, they still have the editable blue boxes and buttons.

Instructions for flattening an inspection report (printing it to Adobe PDF) are found in the newly revised video on that same page, “2019 Process for Completing Sub-

Unit Report video”.

A few things we occasionally encounter is a Tab page having a “No” answer, but there is no discrepancy shown, or an inspection report is uploaded, but it isn’t an inspection report – sometimes it is a worksheet or support document that was uploaded by mistake. I also find that discrepancy verbiage is changed, usually not much, but searching for a particular string of characters will miss those that were changed.

Another mistake which happens very often is not having at least two qualified inspectors on the inspection team. Qualification is determined by running the “IG Course Completion Report” in Member Reports in eServices and verifying there is a date in the “IA Qual” column for at least two of the inspectors. The date must be prior to the inspection date. There has been a common misconception that some of us “Old IGs” are grandfathered in as qualified because we passed a Basic IG or IG Senior Course sometime in the past or even graduated from the IG College. Because of major changes that took place in 2014, the requirement now is that you must pass two Learning Management courses: Introduction to Inspections and Inspection Augmentee Qualification. The courses are easy and they don’t take much time, but there are no waivers to this requirement.

Plans of Action

On the same webpage as the Zipped Team Documents, there is an “Example Plan of Action” that many of you have seen and had to use. Here are some thoughts about how to create one for a discrepancy.

1. *Problem (discrepancy): The _ _ _ Officer failed to prepare and submit the _ _ _ report in a timely manner.*

Just make this item the discrepancy right from the report.

2. *The cause(s) of the problem (discrepancy): The officer was new and unaware of the requirement.*
Whatever you identify as the problem, you will need to state a solution in step 5.

3. *The problem (discrepancy) can be corrected by: Ensure awareness through prompt training (including self-study) at the time of appointment. See #5 below.*

Offer your best suggestion for correcting the discrepancy for this inspection.

4. *The responsible officer(s) to see that corrective action is taken: Commander, Chief of Staff and the officer involved.*

Who is going to fix this (position, not name)? Any position mentioned here is expected to keep track that corrective actions are being taken.

5. *To prevent this from occurring again: Upon appointment, each appointee shall read the inspection checklists for his/her area of responsibility, all materials in the respective Specialty Track Study Guide and those listed in CAP Index 0-2 with the OPR for their position.*

Do some root cause analysis and then propose procedures that will fix the problem permanently and through personnel changes.

6. *Anticipated completion or follow up date (specify): The OI has been published. The _ _ _ Officer has complied. The Chief of Staff is following up with other staff officers.*

When will the problem be fixed?

7. This plan has been reviewed and approved by:

Signature of Unit Commander on
(date)_____

Note: the only name on this plan is the Unit commander's. Discrepancies are not personal.

More Random Thoughts

by Col Ed Burns, CAP/IGT

With the summer season behind us we are now looking forward to 2020 - the year that the next biennial IG College (IGC) will be held. This time we will be assembling in Knoxville, TN at the McGhee Tyson Air National Guard Base. This offering will be a departure from previous IGCs insofar as we will have 3 full days of concentrated work on complaint resolution. Prior to arrival in Knoxville the students will have attended 3 webinars where they will have begun working on their final work product – a complete Report of Investigation. Additional information will be made available over the coming month.



I am happy to report that the new IG Senior Course (IGSC) offered in Baltimore went well and we had 3 instructors attend to learn the new material. Since the IGSC is a requirement for attending the IGC, make sure you checkout the dates of future offerings so you don't miss out. There are no waivers for this requirement.

The new Advanced Inspections Course has been turned over to NHQ for integration into the AXIS online learning system. We are anticipating it being ready for prime time sometime in October. This class is aimed at Inspection Augmentees who desire to become Sub-unit Team Chiefs. Its focus is on the planning, preparation, execution and creating the inspection report.

Speaking about AXIS, we are in the process of moving the Investigating Officer, Introduction to Inspections and the Inspection Augmentee Qualification courses to AXIS. As we do that, we will also be updating those courses to be aligned to the newly-revised CAPRs 20-2 and 20-3.



Stay Tuned!

2020 IG COLLEGE

Over the course of the next month keep an eye out for registration materials being made available for the IGC to be held in Sep 2020.

CAPR 20-2 REVISION

The revision was published on 23 Sep 19. Make sure to review the contents to see the changes that have occurred.

CAPR 20-1 REVISION

All command and NHQ staff input has been received. The implementation of changes will be accomplished, then reviewed by the CAP/COO and then go through the approval process with the CAP/CC and the CAP-USAF/CC. It is expected that these revised regulations will be published sometime in October 2019.

An organization's ability to learn, and translate that learning into action rapidly, is the ultimate competitive advantage.

[Jack Welch](#)



Upcoming Inspector General Training

February 2020

GLR IG Senior Course to be hosted by INWG. This is a placeholder only at this time. More information will be made available on the IG Training page as it becomes available at:

<https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/education-training>

April 2020

SWR IG Senior Course to be hosted by TXWG. This is a placeholder only at this time. More information will be made available on the IG Training page as it becomes available at:

<https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/education-training>

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 IGSC Instructor and schedule the class
5. **Write** a class "Promotion Piece" (Flyer) for region/wing distribution
6. **Recruit** students (20 max)



September 2020

The IG College will be held at the McGhee-Tyson Air National Guard Base in Knoxville, TN from 9-13 September. Additional information will become available over the next month. Check the IG Training page at:

<https://www.gocivilairpatrol.com/members/cap-national-hq/inspector-general/education-training>



Upcoming Compliance Inspections At The Wing Level

WING	CI DATES	CYCLE/INSP#
TX	16-17 Nov 19	5-38
NATCAP	7-8 Dec 19	5-39
KS	11-12 Jan 20	5-40
VA	8-9 Feb 20	5-41

IG Audience/LMS/AXIS - IG Points of Contact

SEND **ARTICLE SUBMISSIONS** FOR THE IG AUDIENCE DIRECTLY TO COL ED BURNS at 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 and AXIS COORDINATOR FOR IG COURSES IS COL ED BURNS at igt@cap.gov

Contact him 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.

Editor's Note:

During the Compliance Inspection presentation at the IGSC in Baltimore, a question was posed regarding the definition of a Commendable as shown in CAPR 20-3, para 10.3 which states: "a commendable must be process-oriented. It should save money, manpower, and have a benefit for the members and/or mission". The student wanted to know if all 3 conditions must be met.

The answer we received from the IGI indicates that in order to qualify as a commendable, **ANY ONE OF THE** three qualifiers needs to be satisfied: (1) Save money, OR (2) Save manpower, OR (3) have a benefit for the members and/or mission.

This definition will receive additional clarification in the next revision to CAPR 20-3.