

From The Point To The Point



MARINE
EXCELLENCE
CENTER for
CONTROLLING
AIRCRAFT

4th Quarter 2012 Volume 7

The Best ATC Training Facility in the Marine Corps

Table of Contents

From The Point	3
Training	5
To The Point	6

ATC Facility Officer – Capt Scott M. Schmitz
SNCOIC – MSgt Uriah D. Bufkin
Training Chief – SSgt Robert C. Kelley
Tower Chief – GySgt Christopher N. Hearn
Radar Chief – SSgt Matthew J. Lange
Writer/Editor – Joseph G. Hendrickson

On the cover

SSgt Matthew J. Lange monitors the Ground Based Sense and Avoid (GBSAA) console which was recently certified by the FAA to provide the necessary safety criteria for unmanned aerial vehicles.

This quarterly newsletter is published solely by the Editor and does not imply any consent, approval or endorsement by the ATCFO or the commander of MCAS Cherry Point.

WWW.CERRYPOINTATC.COM

Jan 2013

From The Point

GBSAA Is Certified

After a grueling three days of intense training and torturous simulations, Team Cherry Point completed a large part of the certification process for the Ground Based Sense and Avoid (GBSAA) system at NAS Patuxent River from 16-18 Nov.

On 22 Oct 12, having returned to Cherry Point, the first live test of the system and its procedures was accomplished. The GBSAA Console (GOCon) Operator was Capt Aleksandr D. Martin-Nims of VMU-2, the Unmanned Aircraft Commander (UAC) was Maj Frank C. Rundus, and the ATC Supervisor was Daniel J. Nowak. With a window of mere seconds, the RQ-7 Shadow unmanned aircraft was approved through the south Operational Transit Volume (OTV) at 1559z and proceeded into R-5306C unscathed.

A GBSAA certification letter was forwarded on 18 Oct 12 from NAVAIR and deemed ready for operational use at MCAS Cherry Point by the FAA on 6 Nov 12.

From The Schoolhouse

PFC Cody A. Kennedy	5 Oct 12
PFC Benjamin Bonilla	24 Oct 12
Sgt Dillon J. Walsh	26 Nov 12
Cpl Corey J. Snow	26 Nov 12
Cpl Augustus S. Rasmussen	30 Nov 12
PFC Joseph A. Rodgers	17 Dec 12
Sgt Jason J. Carey	21 Dec 12

Cherry Point Records Broken in 2012

OJT Instructor Hours – Personal Best

Michael Vitchers – 507.47
Brandon Strasler – 401.08
Donald Schoux – 382.80
Eddie Mobley – 342.00
Michael Seabrook – 319.45

OJT Instructor Hours – Career

Jason Woodin – 5,515

Qualifications

In one month – 32 (tied Aug 2009)
In a calendar year – 252
In a 24-month period – 517
Approach Control West – 20

Student Flow

In a 24-month period – 61
In a 36-month period – 85

OJT and Simulation

Combined hours in a calendar year – 15,430
Radar Flight Data simulation hours – 144.25
Arrival Control simulation hours – 161.68
Approach West simulation hours – 1,021.52
Approach East simulation hours – 312.55
Ground Control simulation hours – 157.90
Ground Control OJT hours – 1,907.67

MOSs Issued

Total MOSs issued - 103
In a calendar year for 7253 – 20
In a calendar year for 7254 – 21

Total Program Hours

In a calendar year – 28,827
In a calendar month – 3,680 (Mar 2012)

From The Point

Trainer of the Year 2012

Mr. Timothy L. Henry has been selected as the MCAS Cherry Point Trainer of the Year. Tim has received this award three times in the past, first in 2005 and then as the first back to back winner in 2009 and 2010. He was the top simulator instructor for the year with 168.23 hours and holds the record of 210.53 hours (2009).

Tim's contribution to the facility's Approach and Final Control simulation program is commendable. He single-handedly develops simulations, monitors and updates scenarios, and teaches others how to maximize the use of the ATCOACH simulator. He has participated in Procedure Evaluation Boards, and contributed to the overhaul of the facility Training and Readiness Supplements.

Tim directly mentored 39 Marines for a total of 530.48 hours, helping his crew complete a total of 104 position qualifications.

Top Five Civilian OJT Instructors

Jordon C. Styrk	528.25
Michael J. Vitchers	507.47
Terry P. Tolster	439.03
Brandon B. Strasler	401.08
Jason D. Woodin	394.65

Top Five Marine OJT Instructors

LCpl Kevin C. David	288.70
LCpl Caitlin K. Higgins	260.48
LCpl Jovanni Pinero	246.75
Sgt Christopher R. Reed	222.35
LCpl Alan P. Shade	192.12

Top Five Simulator Instructors

Timothy L. Henry	168.23
Brandon S. Strasler	158.32
Sgt Andrew S. Kinningham	112.22
LCpl Scott S. Jacobi	94.95
Belinda C. Holbrook	93.42

Top Five Trainees (OJT Hours)

LCpl Richard J. Hession	315.15
Cpl Keith W. Thompson	311.63
LCpl Scott C. Stiffel	307.17
Cpl Michael J. Dufour	296.97
LCpl Brady R. Adams	267.13

Top Five Trainees (Simulation)

LCpl Emerson P. Dorsey	95.80
LCpl Austin D. Orton	88.00
LCpl Scott S. Jacobi	81.73
LCpl Brady R. Adams	77.42
LCpl Cody Z. Curran	70.08

TRACON and Facility Ratings

SSgt Matthew J. Lange	10 Feb 12	Facility
Cpl Derek A. Ulrich	15 May 12	Facility
SSgt Emily L. Griffin	21 May 12	Facility
LCpl Scott S. Jacobi	9 Jul 12	TRACON
LCpl Kevin T. Smith	21 Aug 12	Facility
Cpl Joshua A. Mohundro	29 Aug 12	Facility
LCpl Austin D. Orton	23 Oct 12	TRACON
LCpl Emerson P. Dorsey	26 Oct 12	TRACON

Rookie of the Year

LCpl Scott C. Stiffel

Civilian Instructor Milestones

Terry P. Tolster	5,000 OJT Instructor Hours
John D. Dorgan	4,000 OJT Instructor Hours
William H. Ness	4,000 OJT Instructor Hours

Training

Training Program Statistics

	<u>Oct-Dec</u>	<u>Total</u>
OJT Hours	2,170.27	165,382
OJF Hours	384.10	19,270
Tower Simulation (Training)	170.40	6,722
Tower Simulation (Support)	479.32	7,148
Radar Simulation (Training)	422.39	9,829
Radar Simulation (Support)	583.71	13,566
Simulated GCAs	2,042	55,785
MOSs Issued	21	1,049
Position Qualifications	53	2,900

Controller of the Quarter

LCpl Austin D. Orton was awarded Controller of the Quarter for the 4th quarter of 2012. He joined the facility on 15 Nov 11 and is qualified throughout the radar branch and Tower Flight Data. During this quarter, he had the most time for any Marine as a simulator instructor with 28.60 hours, all on approach and arrival control positions. Aside from his ATC duties, LCpl Orton has participated in more than 20 burial details for H&HS. He obtained a TRACON rating within 11 months and is currently training on Radar Supervisor and Ground Control.

Qualifications

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>MOS</u>
SSgt J. A. Felix	2 Oct 12	FT	
Cpl J. Pongtorn	2 Oct 12	FT	
LCpl M. A. Lorona	10 Oct 12	APW	7253/54
LCpl S. S. Jacobi	12 Oct 12	GC	7257T
LCpl J. E. Entzi	15 Oct 12	FC	7257R
Sgt J. C. Skelton	17 Oct 12	FC	7257R
Sgt D. F. Krause	19 Oct 12	FC	7257R
LCpl A. P. Shade	22 Oct 12	RD	
LCpl A. D. Orton	23 Oct 12	AR	
LCpl E. P. Dorsey	26 Oct 12	APE/APN	
LCpl E. P. Dorsey	26 Oct 12	AR	
SSgt W. N. Allen	26 Oct 12	APW	7253/54
Sgt T. L. Bash	30 Oct 12	GC	7257T
LCpl C. Z. Curran	31 Oct 12	FT	
LCpl J. D. McDaniel	1 Nov 12	FC	7257R
LCpl M. J. Whelton	2 Nov 12	GC	7257T
LCpl D. C. Haydel	5 Nov 12	RD	
Cpl M. J. Dufour	6 Nov 12	APW	7253/54

Qualifications

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>MOS</u>
GySgt L. S. Meyer	8 Nov 12	LC	
PFC N. D. Pollack	19 Nov 12	RD	
LCpl J. D. Warner	19 Nov 12	GC	7257T
Sgt W. T. Stanley	20 Nov 12	AR	7253
LCpl M. A. Van	26 Nov 12	FD	
GySgt J. G. Forgyson	27 Nov 12	RD	
LCpl J. B. Bohannon	28 Nov 12	FC	7257R
LCpl B. M. Poklar	28 Nov 12	LC	7252
Cpl C. B. Fuller	28 Nov 12	LC	7252
LCpl D. J. Turner	1 Dec 12	FD	
LCpl S. C. Stiffel	3 Dec 12	FC	7257R
LCpl M. E. Gonzalez	4 Dec 12	FC	7257R
Sgt C. J. Newsome	6 Dec 12	FC	
Cpl K. W. Thompson	7 Dec 12	APE/APN	7254
SSgt J. L. Johnson	7 Dec 12	APE/APN	
Sgt C. J. Newsome	7 Dec 12	RD	
Sgt S. R. Winjum	12 Dec 12	GC	
LCpl A. D. Orton	19 Dec 12	FD	



To The Point

with
Joe Hendrickson

THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AVERAGE PERFORMANCE

For several years now there have been performance awards given out to civilian employees at MCAS Cherry Point. The awards are in the form of Time Off, Cash Bonus or a combination of both. The system is intended to award individuals based on a 3-tier performance measure. ATC has had much difficulty in determining how controllers fit into three different levels of performance since their normal appraisal system only determines a grade of pass or fail. The two systems are incompatible.

The primary disconnect is that our civilians are appraised more as controllers than as trainers, even though training should be their main focus. As controllers they all pass, which I totally agree, however, since we have the ability to track their performance as trainers of Marines, why not use it. This is the 15th year that I have been tracking OJT and simulation hours by instructor and I can tell you, based purely on performance as an instructor of Marines; there are some above average and some below average. Nobody is average.

Those individuals that are above average seem to have no issue with my ranking. Those that are below average would like to be evaluated more subjectively for their ability to control aircraft. They would also claim that all work is assigned by their supervisors and therefore they have no ability to influence their reportable performance. It must be just coincidence that two of our above average instructors have been in the top tier for most of the past 15 years and that two of our below average instructors have never been. I find it impossible to believe that it is based on work assignment by supervisors. Another example: Three Approach West Instructors, all on the same crew, have OJT Instructor hours of 138, 117 and 114 but simulation hours of 85, 2 and 6. If I were to believe, which I don't, that the disparity is based on work assignment, I would recommend we seriously look at getting a new supervisor.

Some standards established in their Position Description (PD) should be able to be tracked and dissected for performance appraisal purposes. Our GS-12s are expected to divide their talents among three different specialties; 15% Tower Supervisor, 75% Radar Controller and 10% Local Controller. Obviously, these are only guidelines for nominal distribution of work. Grading on these would be nearly impossible. If a person completed the performance period with anything other than the above numbers, what would that mean for performance? Would a higher percentage in Radar make them better performers or would any distribution simply cancel out what is expected? Let's look at the two statements in the PD that refer to training:

- a. "Supervising unqualified controllers on position and in the classroom. Assisting in developing required syllabis (sic) and procedures for on-the-job training, giving lectures, grades and examinations."
- b. "Provide initial MOS qualification training for Marine Air Traffic Controllers."

Based on this, I could argue that our civilian controllers have no requirement to train Marines beyond a Primary MOS of 7257 nor do they even need to be directly involved in OJT or simulation. They only need to develop tools and supervise. The conclusion is that what is expected from their PD and what they do for our training program are two completely different things since what they do for training is very clear, indisputable and in some cases astounding. Of the 17 civilians that were evaluated this past year, I showed 10 of them above average and 7 of them below average. Although the weight of each category is slightly subjective, the empirical data is not, and the scoring is not based on an arbitrary goal but on how each controller is relatively compared. For example, the top OJT Instructor in 2001 accumulated 331 hours. That same person came out on top in 2011 with 762 hours, along with seven others that were above the 331 hour mark. The definition of average changes from year to year.

The point I try to make to the supervisors each year is that since all of our civilians are graded in the "pass" category on a pass/fail system, the one way to break them out for a performance award, and only give the award to those deserving it, is to agree that what they do for the training of Marines is considered worthy of that award. I want to award the above average employees that push themselves and push others into ever increasing output, but until we are able to separate performance from personality we might as well not have a bonus program.