

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER
AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND**



**AIR FORCE SPACE COMMAND
INSPECTION CHECKLIST 90-3**

3 NOVEMBER 2003

Inspector General Complaints

INSPECTOR GENERAL (WING)

NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at:
<http://www.e-publishing.af.mil>

OPR: IGQ (Mr. Curt Watkins)

Certified by: IGQ (Mrs. Jeanne M. Johnson)

Pages: 7

Distribution: F

This checklist reflects Command requirements for the Inspector General Complaints function to prepare for and conduct internal reviews.

1. References have been provided for each critical item. Critical items have been kept to a minimum and are related to public law, safety, security, fiscal responsibility and mission accomplishment. While compliance with non-critical items is not rated, these items help gauge the effectiveness/efficiency of the function.
2. This publication establishes a baseline checklist. The checklist will be used by the Command IG during applicable assessments. Use the checklist at Attachment 1 as a guide only. AFSPC Checklists **will not** be supplemented. Units produce their own standalone checklists as needed to ensure an effective and thorough review of the unit program. Units are encouraged to contact the Command Functional OPR of this checklist to recommend additions and changes deemed necessary. See Attachment 1.

BRADFORD E. WARD, Col, USAF
Inspector General

ATTACHMENT 1

INSPECTOR GENERAL COMPLAINTS (WING)

Table A1.1. Checklist.

MISSION STATEMENT: Raise the standards of AFSPC space and missile forces through inspections and complaint investigations.			
SECTION 1: THE INSPECTOR GENERAL COMPLAINTS PROGRAM			
1.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
1.1.1. If the installation IG is acting in the capacity as an Appointing Authority, has the installation/wing commander designated this authority in writing? (Para 1.4.7)			
1.1.2. Does the installation IG report directly to the installation commander? (Para 1.15.1)			
1.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
1.2.1. Has the IG been assigned additional duties that detract from primary responsibilities, to include the commander's action line and primary focal point for readiness/inspection programs? (Para 1.18.)			
1.2.2. Are IGs or IG staff members appointed as inquiry or investigation officers of Commander Directed Investigations (CDI)? (Para 1.23.5.1)			
1.2.3. Are allegations against senior officials/0-6 and 0-6 equivalents reported immediately to SAF/IGS or SAF/IGQ, through HQ AFSPC/IGQ? (Para 1.26 and 1.27)			
1.2.4. Upon closure of non-IG cases on 0-6/equivalent cases, has the installation IG provided required documents to SAF/IGQ through HQ AFSPC/IGQ? (Table 1.1)			
1.2.5. Have newly assigned IGs and IG staff members attended the Basic Installation IG Training Course? (Para 1.32.1)			
1.2.6. Has the IG actively publicized the IG complaints program through base bulletins and newspapers, newcomers' orientations, leadership schools, staff meetings, commanders' calls and by visiting work centers? (Para 1.34.2)			
1.2.7. Are IG Complaint and Fraud, Waste, and Abuse (FWA) Program posters current and reflect the installation IG's name, location, and phone number as well as the Defense Hotline phone number? (Para 1.34.2.2)			
1.2.8. Are IG reports marked or stamped on the outside of the front cover (if any) or at the bottom of the first page above the "FOUO" marking with the IG disclaimer? (Para 1.35.2.1)			

NON-CRITICAL ITEMS (Cont):	YES	NO	N/A
1.2.9. Are Summary Reports of Investigation in a public releasable format, not marked FOUO, and not signed? (Para 1.35.2.3 and 2.49.3)			
1.2.10. Are all documents provided by the complainant marked as "COMPLAINANT PROVIDED" in the lower right hand corner of each page? (Para 1.35.2.4)			
1.2.11. Do letters that transmit IG reports and records (FOUO material) call attention to the FOUO attachments? (Para 1.36.3)			
1.2.12. Are CDI records maintained by IG personnel within an IG system of records? (Para 1.38.1)			
1.2.13. Are audiotapes erased and demagnetized, or destroyed, after the highest level of quality review has been completed or after the command action has been completed, whichever is later, and after coordination with Judge Advocate (JA)? (Para 1.38.7)			
1.2.14. Are third party complainants not provided a response regarding the substance of alleged wrongs not directly affecting them? (Para 1.41.7.1)			
1.2.15. Are complaints not reported within 60 days of learning of the alleged wrong normally dismissed unless unforeseen circumstances justify the delay? (Para 1.43.1)			
1.2.16. Is the JA performing the legal review on the Report of Investigation (ROI) someone other than the person assigned to advise the Investigating Officer (IO)? (Para 1.46.4.1)			
1.2.17. Are all IG contacts (assists, dismissals, transfers, referrals, Category I and II investigations, Congressionals, etc.), entered into the Automated Case Tracking System (ACTS)? (SAF/IGQ ACTS Users Guide)			
1.2.18. Is the same File Reference Number used in ACTS if a complaint is transferred? (SAF/IGQ ACTS Users Guide)			
SECTION 2: MANAGING IG COMPLAINTS			
2.1. CRITICAL ITEM:	YES	NO	N/A
2.1.1. If an IG conducts a Category II investigation, is an appointment letter completed? (Para 2.23.2)			
2.1.2. Are all Category II investigating officers appointed in writing? (Para 2.25.3)			

CRITICAL ITEMS (Cont):	YES	NO	N/A
2.1.3. Is the IO a commissioned officer, senior NCO (E-7 and above), or a civil service employee equivalent (GS-9 and above)? (Para 2.25.5)			
2.1.4. Is the IO equal to or senior in grade to the subject of the investigation and not in the chain of command of the subject? (Para 2.25.6)			
2.1.5. If a complaint pertains to the Appointing Authority, their immediate staff, or a member of the IG staff, is the complaint elevated to the next higher-level IG? (Para 2.26.1)			
2.1.6. Are only two categories of findings noted in an IG investigation: substantiated and not substantiated? (Para 2.44)			
2.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
2.2.1. Are Category I investigations completed within 45 duty days? (SAF/IGQ policy)			
2.2.2. Are Category II investigations completed within 120 duty days? (Table 2.1)			
2.2.3. Has the appointing authority approved or disapproved requests from the IO, in writing, to grant express confidentiality for witnesses after consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) to determine necessity and advisability? (Para 2.3.4)			
2.2.4. Are complaints not appropriate for the IG system referred to the appropriate agency? (Para 2.18)			
2.2.5. When referring written complaints, was the complaint referred, in writing, to the appropriate agency and the complainant notified in writing of the referral or was the complainant referred to the appropriate grievance channel? (Table 2.6)			
2.2.6. When transferring a complaint, was the complainant notified in writing of the transfer and was the rationale for the transfer clearly communicated? (Table 2.8.)			
2.2.7. When dismissing a written complaint, has the complainant been notified in writing of the dismissal and was the rationale for the dismissal clearly communicated? (Table 2.10)			
2.2.8. Are IGs and IG staff members the only ones conducting Category I investigations? (Para 2.23.1)			
2.2.9. Is the investigation the IO's only duty until the report is completed and approved by the Appointing Authority (AA) unless the AA determines otherwise? (Para 2.25.9)			

NON-CRITICAL ITEMS (Cont):	YES	NO	N/A
2.2.10. Are progress reports received before the suspense date and on the first of every month thereafter until the investigation is completed? (Para 2.28)			
2.2.11. Are interim responses to complainants sent 45 days after receipt of complaint and every 60 days thereafter until final response is provided? (Para 2.29)			
2.2.12. Are allegations reviewed by the JA prior to the start of the investigation? (Para 2.31.2)			
2.2.13. Has the IO interviewed the complainant first in order to re-clarify the allegations and obtain specific details to help with the investigation? (Para 2.34.7)			
2.2.14. Is the subject normally interviewed last? (Para 2.36.1.2)			
2.2.15. Are all witnesses in a Category II investigation sworn in? (Para 2.36.2)			
2.2.16. Is the complainant's and subject's testimony transcribed verbatim? (Para 2.36.2.3)			
2.2.17. Does the summarized testimony state "I certify the above to be a true summary of sworn testimony given to me on (date) at (place)" and is it signed to certify its validity? (Para 2.36.2.4)			
2.2.18. Is a complaint chronology included for all reprisal investigation? (Para 2.40.4)			
2.2.19. Are the subjects of an investigation always handed-off following the initial investigative interview and is it documented in the ROI? (Para 2.41)			
2.2.20. Has the IO (the IG or IG investigative staff member for Category I investigations) signed the last page of the ROI? (Para 2.45.1.1)			
2.2.21. For Category II investigations, has the Appointing Authority approved and signed Section II, Tab D? (Para 2.45.1.2)			
2.2.22. Is the standard format case file for Category I and II investigations being followed? (Figure 2.3)			
2.2.23. Is the proper format followed for the ROI (Category I and II) and the Summary Report of Investigation (SROI)? (Fig 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7)			
2.2.24. For Category I investigations, is a legal review completed for all substantiated allegations and 0-6/equivalent and MHE cases? (Table 2.13)			

SECTION 3: SPECIAL COMPLAINTS			
3.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
3.1.1. Have military members alleging reprisal been advised of the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 1034 and DoDD 7050.6, and of the rights afforded to complainants under the whistleblower protection statute? (Para 3.17.1.1)			
3.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
3.2.1. Do all IG investigations (Category I) against colonels (or equivalent) have at least one legal review? (Para 3.11.2)			
3.2.2. Has the MAJCOM IG been notified of reprisal/restricted access allegations within 7 days? (Para 3.18)			
3.2.3. Has the IG notified SAF/IGQ, through HQ AFSPC/IGQ, within 30 days after receipt of the complaint, of their intent to either investigate or not investigate following completion of a reprisal complaint analysis? (Para 3.19.3.1)			
3.2.4. Does the IG provide a progress report to DOD/IG through SAF/IG and HQ AFSPC/IGQ and an interim response to the complainant if the investigation is not completed within 180 days after receipt of the allegation? (Para 3.20.3)			
3.2.5. Do all reprisal investigations concerning allegations against O-6s/equivalents and below have at least two legal reviews, with one at the MAJCOM level? (Para 3.20.8)			
3.2.6. Has the "Acid Test" been applied to each allegation of reprisal? (Figure 3.3)			
3.2.7. Has the Reprisal Evaluation Form been completed and included in the case file? (Para 3.22)			
3.2.8. Has SAF/IGQ been notified of allegations of improper Mental Health Evaluation (MHE) referral within 7 days from receipt of allegations? (Para 3.29)			
3.2.9. Has a Mental Health Referral Evaluation Form been completed for all improper MHE referral cases? (Para 3.31)			
3.2.10. In those instances when a Congressional member contacts the installation IG with an inquiry that requests an IG investigation, is SAF/IGQ, through HQ AFSPC/IGQ, notified within 24 hours of receipt? (Para 3.32.1)			
3.2.11. Does the installation IG operate a FWA hotline? (Para 3.42.8)			

SECTION 4: IG RECORDS RELEASE			
4.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
None			
4.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS	YES	NO	N/A
4.2.1. Does the Appointing Authority limit release of IG records to only the commander (or the SJA advising the commander) for the purpose of making a determination regarding command (disciplinary) action? (Para 4.3)			
4.2.2. Are all other Official Use Requests submitted to SAF/IGQ, through HQ AFSPC/IGQ, for release determination? (Para 4.4)			
4.2.3. Did the IG obtain a Privacy Act release statement from the subject when a third party requests records on the subject's behalf? (Para 4.5.3)			