2016 State of the Flight Surgeon Report

Society of USAF Flight Surgeons



Survey Author Matthew Ramage, Major, USAF, MC, FS

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon Survey of Line Commanders and Flight Surgeons

Matthew H. Ramage, MD, MS Maj, USAF, MC, FS matthew.ramage.2@us.af.mil

Introduction

In May 2003, the Surgeon General of the Air Force requested that the president of the Society of USAF Flight Surgeons (SoUSAFFS) provide an annual report capturing the "state of the flight surgeon." This assessment, conducted outside commander channels, would provide an independent assessment of priority areas to guide senior leaders in continued improvements. Analysis of this data constitutes the fifth "State of the Flight Surgeon" report. Since the last survey was completed in 2009, the Aerospace Medicine Primary (AMP) course has undergone significant restructuring and relocation from Brooks City Base, Texas to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. As a method to gain greater participation from Air Force physicians already in the field, the course was split into modular blocks. AMP can be completed in a continuous stream, or can be completed in home station-friendly 2 week TDYs. The Residency in Aerospace Medicine (RAM) also moved with the School of Aerospace Medicine to Wright-Patterson. RAM XV represented the transitional class in which there was a Masters year followed by two Aerospace Medicine years. The Occupational or Preventive Medicine year following the Aerospace year has been phased out. The RAM now has added flexibility for the curriculum in that a RAM who is board- certified in another specialty can opt for the one or two-year program following the Masters. General medical Officer (GMO) RAMs are required to complete the two Aerospace Medicine year option as the rotations have been bolstered with increased opportunities for clinical education. While there are core rotations that are required by the American College of Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), each resident can customize a large portion of his or her rotations to meet their individual interests. The RAM has teamed with Greene County Municipal Airport for general aviation instruction. The RAMs undergo ground school followed by individualized flight instruction. The RAM flight training culminates with an optional solo flight in which over 90% of the RAMs have completed.

The goal of this year's evaluation is to "check the pulse" of our flight surgeons and determine those factors that affect retention and overall job satisfaction. In addition, this year's survey also looks to the commanders of the Line of the Air Force assets that we support and garner unfiltered feedback.

Methods

This SoUSAFFS "State of the Flight Surgeon" survey series utilized a number of resources to accomplish, then analyze, a survey of operational line leadership regarding its perceptions of the flight surgeons assigned to, or supporting, operational units. The purpose of the survey was to provide feedback to flight surgeons in the field regarding line perceptions of their performance, and to utilize it as a tool to further enhance current and future education and training emphasis areas. It was designed by a USAF RAM XV, conducted online by using www.surveymonkey.com, and sponsored by the USAF School of Aerospace Medicine. Analysis of the data was accomplished to provide actionable data for the aerospace medicine community.

In addition to flight surgeons in the field, this survey also targeted commanders of operations groups and squadrons involved in active flying or missile/launch operations. In 2006 the survey relied upon reference materials, such as unit level Personnel Accounting System (PAS) files and the Air Force Association Almanac, to construct a comprehensive list of Air Force (AF) units directly supporting major weapons systems. Due to logistical challenges that were present in previous SOFS, the survey dissemination was performed similarly to the method in 2008. The survey link was sent to each of the MAJCOM SGPs with subsequent distribution to the individual bases. The base-level SGPs then encouraged participation of the assigned flight surgeons and the operational flying/controlling unit leadership.

The survey collection period was set for four weeks. Toward the end of the collection period, a reminder email was sent out to MAJCOM SGPs, requesting that they encourage survey participation by flight surgeons and the Line commanders.

Due to the fact that it has been nearly a decade since the last survey, a new assessment of aerospace medicine was needed both from the outside-in and inside-out perspectives. The online survey questioned both flight surgeons and operational line commanders alike. The flight surgeons were questioned regarding quality of life, training, and retention decisions. The commanders were surveyed regarding their perceptions of the abilities, capabilities, and mission support of their flight surgeons. The survey questions are listed throughout the document, but contained in their entirety in Appendix B. The same survey was issued to both groups; however, survey question logic ensured that only the pertinent questions were asked to each participant.

The survey collection window spanned March through April, 2016. SGPs from ACC, AETC, AFMC, AFSOC, AFGSC, AFSPC, AMC, PACAF, and USAFE were contacted to disseminate the surveys to the base-level SGPs with variable success. The survey was conducted under control number: AF16-086SGP.

Statistical analysis was performed using XLSTAT 19.02. Statistical software run files are attached in Appendix C.

The flight surgeons were queried with questions Q1-69 with the following subject emphasis: Flight surgeon population (Q2-6), medical specialty training (Q7-11), quality of life (Q12, 13, 37, 40, 62-66), utility of training (Q14-36, 49-51, 53, 67-69), deployment feedback (Q37-45), job satisfaction (Q46-51, 53-59), and future prospects in the military (Q52, 60-63).

All commanders were queried with general questions about their respective interactions with flight medicine questions (Q70-84). Through question logic, the commander survey is then further divided into specific questions for group and squadron level commanders. Group commanders were asked more specifically regarding the interactions with the SGP (Q85-96). Squadron commanders responded generally about their interactions with the various types of flight surgeons supporting their respective units. Questions (Q101-113) are specific to Squadron Medical Element (SME) flight surgeons whereas questions (Q114-124) are directed to those squadron commanders who are supported by Medical Group attached flight surgeons.

While statistical analysis of all survey data points is the ideal outcome, the majority of the data being presented is descriptive in nature. The data may only be taken at face value to identify empiric trends or to guide future studies. The survey response data is self-evident. I will provide commentary or context where appropriate through this report.

A large limitation in this study is the relative lack of participation from Line of the Air Force squadron commanders. There were 79 Line commanders that responded to the survey, of those 57 were flying or special duty squadron commanders. Of the 57 squadron commander respondents, only 37 provided complete responses that are statistically evaluable. It is my hope that there will be a method to socialize this survey so that the maximum practical participation can be secured. On a positive note, there was significant flight surgeon participation. Of the 175 flight surgeons who answered, 123 of them were "field-level" 48G/48Rs. There were 52 RAMs that completed the survey.

In an attempt to assess the overall effectiveness of the flight surgeon at the lowest practical level for a survey, the squadron commanders' data was statistically evaluated. Questions 101, 102, 116, and 117 were combined to form the overall metric of flight surgeon success, referred to as the "benchmark". In essence, it is the individual commander's perception of the quality of the flight surgeon's advice regarding aeromedical issues, flight safety, and matters of human performance. This factor was reported via a modified Likert scale in decreasing favorability from 1 to 6 with the following verbal descriptions:

1. Superior, 2. Excellent, 3. Good, 4. Fair, 5. Poor, and 6. No opinion.

38 of the respondent squadron commanders answered the benchmark question. The data for SME flight surgeons and attached flight surgeons were combined. In regards to the perception of the quality of advice from the flight surgeons, 16 were rated as "superior", 13 were rated as "excellent", 6 were rated as "good", 2 were rated as "fair". In this survey, no flight surgeon was given the rating of "poor" in regards to advice quality. A sole squadron commander answered this item as "no opinion". Due to the sparse number of flying squadron commander responses to the 2016 SOFS, for statistical evaluation purposes, the rankings of "fair", "poor" were combined and given the numerical score of 4 and were seen as the least favorable outcome. The "no opinion" data was removed from statistical analysis.

Null hypotheses were established, stating that the additional factors of 1. Flight surgeon attendance of flying squadron commander's calls, 2. Attendance of flight safety meetings, 3. Perceived quality of the flight surgeon's presentation in briefings, 4. Performance of regular flying duties with the squadron, and 5. Attendance of social functions were not associated with any difference in the commander's perception of the flight surgeon's advice quality. The data was compiled by using the deidentified Respondent ID to link survey response so that they could undergo KWALLIS testing. Statistical software run files are attached in Appendix C.

Unfortunately, due to the dissimilar formatting of the questions with the combined nature of the 2016 survey and the unavailability of the raw data from the previous surveys, a statistical comparison to the previous surveys was unable to be performed. It is the hope that going forward there will eventually be a standardized question set so that the survey can be run on regular two or three year intervals to provide a trend over time. The raw data will be maintained by Major Ramage and a copy will also be given to the RAMs for storage in the library of the senior classroom.

Results and Discussion: Flight Surgeons

Flight Surgeon Population

Q2: What is your primary Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC)?

Answered: 175 Skipped: 87

Answer Choices	Responses	
A. 48G (General Medical Officer Flight Surgeon)	32.00%	56
B. 48R (Residency Trained Flight Surgeon)	38.29%	67
C. 48A (Aerospace Medicine Specialist)	29.71%	52
D. 40C0C (Medical Commander, Medical)	0.00%	.0
l'otal		175

There are higher portion of RAMs that responded to this survey than exist in the field relative to the 48G and 48R flight surgeons. This could either be a sampling bias due to the high concerntration of RAMs in the distribution chain of the survey or this could represent a lack of emphasis to the clinic level flight surgeons of the SOFS from the base-level SGPs.

Q3: Does this AFSC match your primary duties?

Answered: 174 Skipped: 88

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	91.38%	159
No	8.62%	15
Fotal		174

Q4: Which of the following describes your current primary job or position? (Check all that apply)

Answered: 175 Skipped: 87

Answer Choices	Responses	
A. Squadron Medical Element Flight Surgeon	28.00%	49
B. Medical Treatment Facility Flight Surgeon	30.29%	53
C. Flight Commander	9.71%	17
D. Squadron Commander	12.00%	21
E. Medical Treatment Facility Commander	0.00%	
F. Headquarters Staff	5.14%	ç
SGP	25.14%	44
G. Other	20.00%	35
Total Respondents: 175		

Q5: Which aerospace medicine jobs/positions have you held? (Check all that apply)

that apply)		Answer Choices	Responses	
Answered: 167 Skipped: 95	A. Squadron Medical Element Flight Surgeon	61.68%	103	
		B. Medical Treatment Facility Flight Surgeon	70.66%	118
		C. Chief of Aerospace Medicine (SGP)	45.51%	76
		D. Flight Commander	36.53%	61
		E. Squadron Commander	22.75%	38
		F. Group Commander	2.99%	5
		G. MAJCOM Aerospace Medicine Staff	4.19%	7
		H. MAJCOM Chief of Aerospace Medicine	4.19%	7
		I. AF/SG Aerospace Medicine Staff	2.99%	5
		J. AF/SG Chief of Aerospace Medicine	0.00%	0
		K. USAFSAM Staff/Instructor	3.59%	6
		L. USAFSAM Staff/Clinical	4.79%	8
		M. Other Staff (IG, AFSA, SGX, etc.)	5.99%	10
		N. Other operational (Pilot-Physician, NASA, etc.)	4.79%	8
		Total Respondents: 167		

Q6: I am currently or have been assigned as a flight surgeon with my primary aircraft of assignment being a fighter/attack major weapons system.

Answered: 175 Skipped: 87

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	45.14%	79
No	54.86%	96
Total		175

Due to the decreasing presence of two-seat fighter aircraft, it will be interesting to see how this metric trends over time.

Medical Specialty Training

Q7: Are you board-certified in Aerospace Medicine?

Answered: 175 Skipped: 87

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	22.86%	40
No	77.14%	135
Total		175

Q8: If board-certified or board-eligible in Aerospace Medicine, how long ago did you graduate from the USAF Residency in Aerospace Medicine?

Answered: 39 Skipped: 223

Answer Choices	Respons	ses
A, <1 year ago	15.38%	6
B. 1-5 years ago	48.72%	19
C. 6-10 years ago	15.38%	6
D. >10 years ago	17.95%	7
E. I am board-certified/eligible in Aerospace Medicine, but not a USAFSAM RAM graduate.	2.56%	1
F. I am not a graduate of a Residency in Aerospace Medicine.	0.00%	.0
Total .		39

In the recent decade there has been more of an emphasis to recruit younger flight surgeons into the RAM. The hope is to retain the talent as long as possible as opposed to providing residency training to a physician that is nearing the end of his or her respective military career.

Q9: The USAF Residency in Aerospace Medicine prepared me well for my duties as an Aerospace Medicine Specialist.

Answered: 39 Skipped: 223

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
(no	20.51%	41.03%	28.21%	5.13%	5.13%		
label)	8	16	11	2	2	39	2.33

This is an alarming attestation from a large number of RAMs. The RAM exists to build a cadre of leaders for aerospace medicine as well as the Air Force Medical Service as a whole. Through constructive feedback from the field, the RAM can be agile and dynamically change to serve its two masters, the ACGME and the demands of the Line. It is incumbent on each and every RAM to ping the school house with tactical lessons learned so that the future generations of RAMs will have the benefit of our experience.

Q10: Are you board-certified in a medical specialty other than Aerospace Medicine?

Answered: 172 Skipped: 90

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	60.47%	104
No	39.53%	68
otal		172

Q11: In what other medical specialty(s) are you board-certified? (Check all that apply)

Answered: 108 Skipped: 154

Answer Choices	Responses	
A. Family Medicine (Family Practice)	69.44%	75
B. Internal Medicine	11.11%	12
C. Pediatrics	4.63%	5
D. Surgery	0.00%	0
E. Occupational Medicine	14.81%	16
F. Preventive Medicine	2.78%	3
G. Psychiatry	0.00%	0
H. Other	13.89%	15
Total Respondents: 108		

Quality of Life

Q12: I have moved approximately every _____ years since becoming a flight surgeon.

Answered: 172 Skipped: 90

Answer Choices	Responses	
A.1	0.58%	1
B. 2	28.49%	49
C. 3	26.16%	45
D. 4	5.81%	10
E. 5+	2.33%	4
F.N/A	36.63%	63
Total		172

Q13: How long ago did you graduate from the Aerospace Medicine Primary (AMP) Course?

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses	
A. < 1 year ago	15.20%	26
B. 1-5 years ago	38.01%	65
C. 6-10 years ago	19.30%	33
D. > 10 years ago	27.49%	.47
Total		171

Training Feed Back

Q14: The Aerospace Medicine Primary (AMP) Course prepared me well for my duties as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 172 Skipped: 90

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
(no	8.72%	49.42%	18.60%	15.70%	7.56%		
label)	15	85	32	27	13	172	2.64

This survey item emphasizes the need for mentorship at the base level. AMP is not designed, nor should it be, to field a battle-ready flight surgeon to take on the perils of a very different type of clinical medicine. AMP provides a flight surgeon with the foundation on which to build knowledge, but that growth must be facilitated. All too often there is the occurrence of a manning perfect storm where an MTF has a distinct lack of experience in aerospace medicine. I have experienced first-hand two new captains essentially flipping a coin to determine the SGP position. Aerospace medicine is a specialty that requires constant mentorship and significant corporate knowledge of the enterprise. If senior flight surgeons don't take the young ones under their wings, there is a tendency for water to flow though the course of least resistance, thus the unfortunate Medical Group stereotypes regarding flight medicine are perpetuated.

Q15: Sustainment and refresher training is available after the Aerospace Medicine Primary (AMP) Course to maintain the skills I need to perform my duties.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
(no	5.26%	43.27%	21.05%	22.81%	7.60%		
label)	9	74	36	39	13	171	2.8

Q16: Sustainment and refresher training is adequate after the Aerospace Medicine Primary (AMP) Course to maintain the skills I need to perform my duties.

Answered: 172 Skipped: 90

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
(no	4.07%	38.37%	32.56%	18.02%	6.98%		
label)	7	66	56	31	12	172	2.8

Q17: As a flight surgeon, I have attended Advanced Trauma Life Support (ATLS) Training.

Answered: 172 Skipped: 90

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	81.98%	141
No	18.02%	31
otal		172

Q18: I found Advanced Trauma Life Support (ATLS) Training beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 141 Skipped: 121

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	80.14%	113
No	19.86%	28
Total		141

Q19: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Aircraft Mishap Investigation and Prevention (AMIP) Course.

Answered: 172 Skipped: 90

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	60.47%	104
No	39.53%	68
Total		172

Q20: I found the Aircraft Mishap Investigation and Prevention (AMIP) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 104 Skipped: 158

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	87.50%	91
No	12.50%	13
Total		104

Q21: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Global Medicine Course.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	36.26%	62
No	63.74%	109
Total		171

Q22: I found the Global Medicine Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 62 Skipped: 200

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	93.55%	58
No	6.45%	4
Fotal		62

Q23: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Advanced Clinical Concepts in Aeromedical Evacuation (ACCAE) Course.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	29.82%	51
No	70.18%	120
Total		171

Q24: I found the Advanced Clinical Concepts in Aeromedical Evacuation (ACCAE) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 51 Skipped: 211

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	80.39%	41
No	19.61%	10
Total		51

Q25: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Contingency Preventive Medicine (CPM) Course.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	5.26%	9
No	94.74%	162
Total		171

Q26: I found the Contingency Preventive Medicine (CPM) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 9 Skipped: 253

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	77.78%	7	
No	22.22%	2	
Total		9	

Q27: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Occupational Medicine Course.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	34.50%	59	
No	65.50%	112	
Total		171	

Q28: I found the Occupational Medicine Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 58 Skipped: 204

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	89.66%	52
No	10.34%	6
Total		58

Q29: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Human Performance Enhancement (HPE) Course.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	1.75%	3	
No	98.25%	168	
Total		171	

Q30: I found the Human Performance Enhancement (HPE) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 3 Skipped: 259

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	66.67%	2
No	33.33%	1
Total		3

Q31: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Critical Care Air Transport Team (CCATT) Course.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	9.36%	16	
No	90.64%	155	
Total		171	

Q32: I found the Critical Care Air Transport Team (CCATT) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 16 Skipped: 246

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	81.25%	13	
No	18.75%	3	
Total		16	

Q33: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Top Knife Course.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	36.26%	62
No	63.74%	109
Total		171

Q34: I found the Top Knife Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.

Answered: 62 Skipped: 200

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	96.77%	60	
No	3.23%	2	
Total		62	

Q35: As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Chief of Aeromedical Services and Advanced Flight Surgeon Symposium (SGP Course).

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	37.43%	64	
No	62.57%	107	
Total		171	

Q36: I found the Chief of Aeromedical Services and Advanced Flight Surgeon Symposium (SGP Course) beneficial to my responsibilities as an SGP or senior flight surgeon.

Answered: 64 Skipped: 198

Answer Choices	Responses		
Yes	82.81%	53	
No	17.19%	11	
Total		64	

Q49: I am well trained to perform patient care duties expected of me.

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
(no	44.24%	41.21%	6.67%	6.06%	1.82%		
label)	73	68	11	10	3	165	1.8

Q50: I am well trained to perform operational/deployment support tasking.

Answered: 166 Skipped: 96

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
(no	25.90%	44.58%	16.27%	10.24%	3.01%		
label)	43	74	27	17	5	166	2.2

Q51: I am well trained to perform command and leadership functions expected of me.

Answered: 167 Skipped: 95

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Weighted Average
(no	20.36%	32.93%	28.14%	15.57%	2.99%		
label)	34	55	47	26	5	167	2.48

Q53: I feel properly trained to do my job well.

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	24.24%	44.85%	15.76%	11.52%	3.64%	0.00%		
label)	40	74	26	19	6	0	165	2.25

Q67: The Aerospace Medical Association (AsMA) annual meeting is valuable for my professional development.

Answered: 164 Skipped: 98

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	20.12%	23.78%	13.41%	4.88%	4.88%	32.93%		
label)	33	39	22	8	8	54	164	2.26

Q68: The Association of Military Surgeons of the U.S. (AMSUS) annual meeting is valuable for my professional development.

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	1.82%	5.45%	24.85%	7.88%	6.67%	53.33%		
label)	3	9	41	13	11	88	165	3.26

Q69: Which Society of USAF Flight Surgeons products/events do you find useful? (Check all that apply)

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

Answer Choices	Response	s
Flight Surgeon's Checklist	52.12%	86
Aircraft Mishap Investigation Handbook	62.42%	103
Flight Surgeons Toolkit (CD-ROM)	16.97%	28
FlightLines (Newsletter)	25.45%	42
Website	16.36%	27
SOUSAFFS luncheon (at AsMA annual meeting)	12.12%	20
SOUSAFFS social (at AsMA annual meeting)	12.12%	20
I do not find any of the listed products/events useful	5.45%	S
I have not used or attended any of the listed products/events	23.03%	38
Total Respondents: 165		

Deployment

Q37: I have been deployed _____ months in the past three years.

Answered: 171 Skipped: 91

Answer Choices	Responses	
0	60.82%	104
1-4	15.79%	27
5-8	13.45%	23
9-12	5.26%	9
>12	4.68%	8
Total		171

Q38: I was well trained to perform the patient care duties required of me while deployed.

Answered: 68 Skipped: 194

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	36.76%	52.94%	5.88%	1.47%	2.94%	0.00%		
label)	25	36	4	1	2	0	68	1.81

Q39: My training adequately prepared me to accomplish the operational tasks required of me while deployed.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	40.30%	46.27%	8.96%	0.00%	4.48%	0.00%		
label)	27	31	6	0	3	0	67	1.82

Q40: My family was prepared for my deployment.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	16.42%	55.22%	5.97%	10.45%	4.48%	7.46%		
label)	11	37	4	7	3	5	67	2.26

Q41: My family was well cared for during my deployment.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	17.91%	37.31%	23.88%	4.48%	7.46%	8.96%		
label)	12	25	16	3	5	6	67	2.41

Q42: While deployed the right equipment was available for my team.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	14.93%	50.75%	16.42%	8.96%	5.97%	2.99%		
label)	10	34	11	6	4	2	67	2.38

Q43: While deployed the equipment was in good repair for my team.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	16.42%	49.25%	19.40%	5.97%	5.97%	2.99%		
label)	11	33	13	4	4	2	67	2.34

Q44: My support staff was well trained for the deployment mission.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	19.40%	44.78%	16.42%	7.46%	7.46%	4.48%		
label)	13	30	11	5	5	3	67	2.36

Q45: I deployed with the right complement of professional and support staff.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	H/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	20.90%	44.78%	8.96%	19.40%	4.48%	1.49%		
label)	14	30	6	13	3	1	67	2.41

Job Satisfaction

Q46: The most important mentor(s) I have had in my military career has been the following: (Check all that apply)

Answered: 167 Skipped: 95

Answer Choices	Responses	
Supervisors/Commanders	55.69%	93
Instructors/professors	16.77%	28
Senior 4F0Xs	20.96%	35
Peers	48.50%	81
Other leaders	23.95%	40
I have not been mentored well	26.95%	45
otal Respondents: 167		

Nearly one quarter of flight surgeon respondents reported that they have never been mentored. This harkens back to the discussion that accompanies question 14. In order to continue to be viable as a medical specialty, we have to foster the growth of our own. Daily/regular informal mentorship is one of the best methods to continue passing the torch of aerospace medicine.

Q47: I have the greatest difficulty or feel most uncomfortable with _____.

Answered: 160 Skipped: 102

Answer Choices	Responses	
Medical skills	11.25%	18
Administrative requirements	41.25%	66
Accomplishing flying events	18.75%	30
Officership/military personnel requirements	20.63%	33
Deployed operations	8.13%	13
Fotal		160

Q48: The top three barriers to performing my job are: (Choose three)

Answered: 164 Skipped: 98

Answer Choices	Responses	
Training	50.61%	83
Staff	62.20%	102
Guidance	65.85%	108
Leadership	50.00%	82
Equipment/Space	43.90%	72
Total Respondents: 164		

Q54: I have the tools and equipment to do my job well.

Answered: 166 Skipped: 96

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	12.65%	52.41%	21.69%	9.64%	3.61%	0.00%		
label)	21	87	36	16	6	0	166	2.39

Q55: The Air Force provides me with adequate guidance to do my job well.

Answered: 164 Skipped: 98

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	9.76%	36.59%	27.44%	18.90%	6.71%	0.61%		
label)	16	60	45	31	11	1	164	2.76

Q56: My enlisted support staff is trained and sufficient to help me do my job well.

Answered: 167 Skipped: 95

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	H/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	11.98%	42.51%	19.16%	16.17%	6.59%	3.59%		
label)	20	71	32	27	11	6	167	2.61

Q57: My leadership supports me and encourages me to do my job well.

Answered: 167 Skipped: 95

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	23.95%	47.90%	13.77%	8.98%	5.39%	0.00%		
label)	40	80	23	15	9	0	167	2.24

Q58: The environment I work in today is friendlier now than three years ago.

Answered: 166 Skipped: 96

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	10.84%	21.69%	26.51%	17.47%	9.64%	13.86%		
label)	18	36	44	29	16	23	166	2.92

This is another alarming bit of information that we should monitor closely in the upcoming years. A weakness that I discovered retrospectively with the survey is that I did not provide a cue for commentary following this question. There clearly is a curve centered over neutral. I am interested to see that factors that can be modified to make the flight surgeon work environment better.

Q59: I enjoy being a flight surgeon in the Air Force.

Answered: 166 Skipped: 96

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	39.16%	36.75%	13.86%	6.02%	3.61%	0.60%		
label)	65	61	23	10	6	1	166	1.98

Future Military Prospects

Q52: I plan to become a medical leader in the Air Force (commander, command surgeon, etc.).

Answered: 167 Skipped: 95

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	26.35%	28.74%	10.18%	10.78%	17.96%	5.99%		
label)	44	48	17	18	30	10	167	2.63

Q60: I plan to stay in the USAF for the following term:

Answered: 163 Skipped: 99

Answer Choices	Response	s
Only for my training commitment	22.70%	37
Beyond my training commitment but short of retirement eligibility	12.88%	21
Just until retirement eligibility	34.97%	57
Past retirement eligibility	29.45%	48
otal		163

Q61: What are the top 3 things keeping you in the aerospace medicine career field? (Choose three)

Answered: 162 Skipped: 100

Answer Choices	Responses	
Military family lifestyle	41.36%	67
Flying/operational opportunities	84.57%	137
Deployment opportunities	32.10%	52
Clinical environment	37.04%	60
Future military opportunities (command, promotion)	35.80%	58
Future civilian jobs unattractive	5.56%	5
Pay/bonuses	20.99%	34
Recession	2.47%	
Other	24.69%	4
Total Respondents: 162		

It appears as though most flight surgeons enjoy their work and there is an overwhelming trend among respondents to stay in at least past their commitment. It I interesting that by nearly double the amount of the closest factor, flying opportunities are the resounding reason why physicians stay in flight medicine. Aside from the importance of understanding the rigors of the aerospace environment, flying itself is an excellent recruitment and retention tool for flight surgeons. Anecdotally, when I have talked with fellow international flight surgeons from nations without the emphasis performance of flying duty for the flight surgeons, they seem to lack the zeal for the career that we do. In further discussion, there doesn't seem to be all that much that differentiates them from the average clinical practitioner from their military. The military lifestyle for the family is an interesting distant second reason. We always hear rumblings of deployment tempo taking its toll on the family; however, when a well bolstered network of military families is formed, the resilience for the family and in turn the member is magnified.

Q62: If you plan to leave the USAF before retirement eligibility, which factors most influenced this decision? (Check all that apply)

Answered: 163 Skipped: 99

Answer Choices	Responses	
Personal/family reasons	26.38%	43
Civilian employment opportunities	18.40%	30
Deployments/ops tempo	12.27%	20
Dissatisfaction with work	25.77%	42
Electronic medical record (AHLTA)	17.79%	29
Future military opportunities unclear	15.34%	25
Future military jobs unattractive	18.40%	30
Pay/Bonuses	17.79%	29
Other	9.20%	15
I do not plan to leave the USAF before retirement eligibility	55.21%	9(
Total Respondents: 163		

Q63: The following factors are important considerations to my remaining in the Air Force:

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagre	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
Opportunity	53.33%	32.12%	4.24%	6.06%	3.64%	0.61%		
to fly	88	53	7	10	6	1	165	1.74
Financial	40.00%	39.39%	7.88%	9.09%	3.64%	0.00%		
compensation	66	65	13	15	6	0	165	1.97
Professional	37.42%	41.72%	11.66%	4.29%	4.91%	0.00%		
autonomy	61	68	19	7	8	0	163	1.9
Confidence in	35.76%	36.36%	13.33%	7.27%	7.27%	0.00%		
leadership	59	60	22	12	12	0	165	2.1
Input into the	38.18%	31.52%	12.12%	10.30%	6.67%	1.21%		
assignment process	63	52	20	17	11	2	165	2.1
Time available	29.27%	47.56%	10.98%	7.93%	4.27%	0.00%		
to take leave	48	78	18	13	7	0	164	2.1

Q63: The following factors are important considerations to my remaining in the Air Force: (continued)

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

Sense of duty	52.73% 87	33.94 % 56	6.06% 10	4.85 %	2.42 %	0.00%	165	1.7
Quality work	37.20%	43.29%	9.15%	7.93%	2.44%	0.00%		
environment	61	71	15	13	4	0	164	1.9
Health	34.97%	36.81%	19.02%	3.68%	3.68%	1.84%		
benefits for the family	57	60	31	6	6	3	163	2.0
Lifestyle	35.98%	44.51%	10.37%	6.10%	3.05%	0.00%		
	59	73	17	10	5	0	164	1.9
Frequency of	20.73%	26.83%	32.93%	8.54%	9.15%	1.83%		
PCS	34	44	54	14	15	3	164	2.5
Frequency of	25.00%	25.61%	29.27%	10.98%	5.49%	3.66%		
deployments	41	42	48	18	9	6	164	2.4
Length of	28.05%	23.17%	29.27%	7.93%	7.93%	3.66%		
deployments	46	38	48	13	13	6	164	2.4
Unique	34.55%	40.61%	13.94%	6.06%	4.85%	0.00%		
challenges of aerospace medicine	57	67	23	10	8	0	165	2.

Q64: My family's healthcare, financial, and legal needs were met during the last 12 months.

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	H/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	42.42%	41.21%	4.24%	4.85%	1.21%	6.06%		
label)	70	68	7	8	2	10	165	1.74

Q65: My spouse has been able to maintain a satisfying career while I have been on active duty.

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	10.91%	18.79%	10.30%	13.94%	16.97%	29.09%		
label)	18	31	17	23	28	48	165	3.10

Q66: My family is supportive of my Air Force career.

Answered: 165 Skipped: 97

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	Total	Weighted Average
(no	38.18%	39.39%	9.70%	3.64%	1.82%	7.27%		
label)	63	65	16	6	3	12	165	1.83

Results and Discussion: Line Commanders

Q70: Do your flight surgeons speak to your personnel at safety briefings, Commander's Calls, or other appropriate venues?

Answered: 79 Skipped: 183

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	36.71%	49.37%	13.92%		
	29	39	11	79	1.77

37% (29) of OG/CC and SQ/CC state the flight surgeons speak at various official venues frequently. **49% (39)** state that this occurs occasionally and **14% (11)** say not at all.

Q71: Please rate the impact of these briefings on your mission.

Answered: 68 Skipped: 194

	Strong Positive Impact	Positive Impact	Neutral	Negative Impact	Strong Negative Impact	Total	Weighted Average
(no	16.18%	69.12%	14.71%	0.00%	0.00%		
label)	11	47	10	0	0	68	1.99

For those commanders that experience flight surgeon briefings the following impact is reported: **16% (11) strong positive, 69% (47) positive, 15% (10) neutral, and 0% negative.** Of the write in comments that were received, this most notable negative remarks were flight surgeons "checking to container" by giving the same briefings from flight medicine's Greatest Hits album. We would benefit by trying to instill the mindset of making these briefings meaningful or not doing them at all. "Fast or funny" rules still apply.

Q72: Please rate the overall quality of these briefings.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 195

	Exceptional Quality	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	11.94%	46.27%	35.82%	4.48%	0.00%	1.49%		
label)	8	31	24	3	0	1	67	2.3

12% (8) report exceptional quality briefings, while 46% (31), 36% (24), and 4% (3) report high, adequate, and marginal quality respectively.

Q73: Do your flight surgeons fly regularly and frequently?

Answered: 77 Skipped: 185

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	61.04%	47
No	22.08%	17
Unsure	16.88%	13
Total		77

61% (47) of commander's state that their flight surgeons are flying regularly. 22% (17) and 17% (13) report no or "not sure". I am not entirely certain which is more frustrating, the fact that some flight surgeons have made a lasting impression that their commander know they don't fly or that there is so little contact that the commanders are unsure whether the flight surgeons are flying or not. I admit that there is a myriad of reasons that a flight surgeon might not fly regularly: the ever-increasing workload with decreasing manning, individual health reasons, or a personal dislike of flying. Whatever the reason, valid or otherwise, one thing remains clear. If the flight surgeon is not immersed in the operational environment of those who they support, then the intent of Dr. Lyster is not being met...in turn this could lead to disconnection from the Line and subsequent damaging human performance gaps in the future.

Q74: How credible do your flyers consider your fight surgeons as good and effective physicians/clinicians?

Answered: 73 Skipped: 189

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	23.29%	41.10%	26.03%	6.85%	2.74%		
	17	30	19	5	2	73	2.2

Credibility as a physician: 23% (17) superior, 41% (30) excellent, 26% (19) good, 7% (5) fair, and 3% (2) poor.

Q75: Please rate your flight surgeons in terms of level of respect accorded them as aircrew.

Answered: 72 Skipped: 190

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	20.83%	30.56%	29.17%	18.06%	1.39%		
	15	22	21	13	1	72	2.49

Respect of flight surgeons as aircrew members: 21% (15) superior, 31% (22) excellent, 29% (21) good, 18% (13) fair, and 1% (1) poor.

Q76: How 'easy' or 'tough' are your flight surgeons when determining flying status (DNIF or RTFS) when you balance flying safety, the manpower needs for mission completion, and appropriate medical care?

Answered: 73 Skipped: 189

	Overly Restrictive	About Right	Overly Permissive	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	9.59%	90.41%	0.00%		
	7	66	0	73	1.90

There is an empiric belief held by many aircrew members that "the best you can do when seeing the flight doc is break even". It is refreshing to see that **90% (66)** of commanders view the flight surgeon's medical judgment to be appropriate. **10% (7)** think that he or she is being overly restrictive.

Q77: Please rate your flight surgeons' communication skills and efforts.

Answered: 71 Skipped: 191

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	26.76%	45.07%	21.13%	4.23%	2.82%		
	19	32	15	3	2	71	2.1

Q78: Please rate your installation flight surgeons' depth and breadth of knowledge in the following areas:

Answered: 71 Skipped: 191

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Operational	29.58%	47.89%	15.49%	1.41%	2.82%	2.82%		
Issues	21	34	11	1	2	2	71	1.97
Flight Safety	39.44%	46.48%	9.86%	0.00%	1.41%	2.82%		
Issues	28	33	7	0	1	2	71	1.74
Occupational	38.03%	43.66%	9.86%	1.41%	1.41%	5.63%		
Health	27	31	7	1	1	4	71	1.78
General	43.66%	46.48%	5.63%	2.82%	1.41%	0.00%		
Medical	31	33	4	2	1	0	71	1.72
Practice								

Q79: Please rate your level of satisfaction with level of demonstrated preparedness of your flight surgeons for:

Answered: 71 Skipped: 191

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Mishap Response and Investigation	32.39 % 23	39.44% 28	9.86% 7	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	18.31% 13	71	1.72
Other Casualty response	22.54% 16	36.62% 26	11.27% 8	0.00%	0.00%	29.58 % 21	71	1.84

Q80: Please provide your overall rating of your flight surgeons' impact on:

Answered: 71 Skipped: 191

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Flying Safety	38.03% 27	47.89 % 34	8.45 %	0.00 %	1.41 %	4.23 % 3	71	1.74
Mission Completion	44.29 % 31	40.00% 28	11.43% 8	2.86 %	1.43 %	0.00%	70	1.77

Q81: Do the families of your flyers obtain their basic medical care primarily at the Flight Medicine Clinic?

Answered: 70 Skipped: 192

Answer Choices	Responses			
Yes	72.86%	51		
No	17.14%	12		
No, our Flight Medicine Clinic does not see dependents	10.00%	7		
Fotal		70		

Q82: How well do your flight surgeons meet the families' health care needs?

Answered: 65 Skipped: 197

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Weighted Average
(no label)	20.00%	40.00%	29.23%	7.69%	3.08%		
	13	26	19	5	2	65	2.34

Q84: Please select the description that applies.I am a/an:

Answered: 72 Skipped: 190

Answer Choices	Responses	
Operations Group Commander	16.67%	12
Squadron Commander	79.17%	57
None of the above	4.17%	3
Fotal		72

Operations Group Commander SGP Assessment

Q85: How long have you been, or were you, an operations group commander?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than 6 months	0.00%	0
6- 12 Months	33.33%	4
13-18 Months	8.33%	1
19- 24 Months	50.00%	6
Greater than 24 Months	8.33%	1
otal		12

Q86: For which weapon systems are your operations group responsible?

nswered: 12 Skipped: 250	Answer Choices	Responses	
	Airborne Command and Control	25.00%	3
	Attack/Fighter	33.33%	4
	Bomber	0.00%	0
	Cargo	16.67%	2
	High Performance Trainer	25.00%	3
	Heavy Trainer	25.00%	3
	Air Reconnaissance	8.33%	1
	Helicopter	8.33%	1
	Missile and/or Launch Ops	0.00%	0
	RPA	8.33%	1
	ISR/Cyber	0.00%	0
	Other	33.33%	4
	Total Respondents: 12		

Q87: Do you consider your SGP to be your primary aeromedical advisor regarding flight or missile crew medical issues, flying safety, human factors and human performance enhancement?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	91.67%	11
No	8.33%	1
Total		12

Q88: Please rate the performance of your Chief of Aeromedical Services (SGP) in this capacity.

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	25.00%	50.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%		
label)	3	6	2	0	0	1	12	1.91

Q89: Does your Chief of Aeromedical Services (SGP) attend any of your OG meetings?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	50.00%	6
Occasionally	25.00%	3
Never	25.00%	3
rotal .		12

Q90: Does your Chief of Aeromedical Services attend Wing Standup?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	50.00%	6
Occasionally	33.33%	4
Never	16.67%	2
Total		12

Q91: Please rate your Chief of Aeromedical Services on how well he/she advises wing leadership regarding medical and operational factors that enhance war fighter effectiveness.

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	25.00%	50.00%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%		
label)	3	6	2	0	0	1	12	1.9

Q92: Please rate the performance of your Chief of Aeromedical Services in identifying gaps in the capabilities of the human weapons system in your wing, and making recommendations, or implementing plans to close those gaps.

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	25.00%	50.00%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
label)	3	6	3	0	0	0	12	2.00

Q93: Please rate the performance of your Chief of Aeromedical Services as a consultant to commanders and supervisors regarding aeromedical problems related to aircraft or life support equipment, mission plans, and human performance enhancement.

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	41.67%	41.67%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
label)	5	5	2	0	0	0	12	1.7

Q94: Please rate your Chief of Aeromedical Services' advice to you and your wing leadership regarding medical, environmental and operational factors that influence war fighter effectiveness and mission completion.

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	33.33%	50.00%	8.33%	0.00%	0.00%	8.33%		
label)	4	6	1	0	0	1	12	1.73

Q95: Please rate your Chief of Aeromedical Services' depth and breadth of knowledge in the following areas:

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Operational	33.33%	41.67%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
Issues	4	5	3	0	0	0	12	1.92
Flight Safety	33.33%	41.67%	25.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
Issues	4	5	3	0	0	0	12	1.93
Occupational	25.00%	58.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
Health	3	7	2	0	0	0	12	1.93
Medicine and	41.67%	58.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
Medical	5	7	0	0	0	0	12	1.5
Practice								

Q96: How well prepared is your Chief of Aeromedical Services to lead the other flight surgeons at your installation?

Answered: 12 Skipped: 250

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
label)	4	4	4	0	0	0	12	2.

Due to the limited participation Operations Group commanders and lack of more granular data that can be match, unfortunately there are no internal statistical analyses that can be performed with SGP data. The Squadron commanders however have provided and interesting insight into the factors that shape their perception of flight surgeon performance.

Squadron Commander

Q98: How long have (had) you been a squadron commander?

Answered: 57 Skipped: 205

Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than 6 months	7.02%	4
6-12 Months	43.86%	25
13-18 Months	7.02%	4
19- 24 Months	38.60%	22
Greater than 24 Months	3.51%	2
Total		57

Q99: For which weapon system is (was) your squadron responsible?

Answered: 57 Skipped: 205

Answer Choices	Responses	
Airborne Command and Control	8.77%	É
Attack/Fighter	17.54%	10
Bomber	8.77%	5
Cargo	10.53%	6
High Performance Trainer	15.79%	Ş
Heavy Trainer	3.51%	
Reconnaissance	8.77%	4
Helicopter	7.02%	
Missile and/or Launch Ops	0.00%	
RPA	3.51%	
Other	26.32%	15
otal Respondents: 57		

Q100: My squadron has:

Answered: 57 Skipped: 205

Answer Choices	Responses	
A squadron medical element (SME) flight surgeon	26.32%	15
One (1) attached flight surgeon	33.33%	19
Multiple attached flight surgeons	14.04%	8
No SME or attached flight surgeon	26.32%	15
Total		57

Q103: Please rate the performance of your SME flight surgeon in providing and arranging medical training for the other SME personnel.

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	35.71%	57.14%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
label)	5	8	1	0	0	0	14	1.71

Q108: Please rate the performance of your SME flight surgeon in supervising the other members of your SME.

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	35.71%	57.14%	0.00%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%		
label)	5	8	0	0	1	0	14	1.86

Q111: Please rate your SME's flight surgeon's depth and breadth of knowledge in the following areas:

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Operational Issues	28.57 %	57.14% 8	14.29 % 2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14	1.86
Flight Safety Issues	42.86 %	42.86 %	14.29 % 2	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	14	1.71
Occupational Health	57.14% 8	35.71% 5	7.14 %	0.00%	0.00% 0	0.00%	14	1.50
Medicine and Medical Practice	50.00% 7	42.86 %	7.14 %	0.00 %	0.00 %	0.00% O	14	1.57

Q112: While you have been, or were, a squadron commander, did your SME flight surgeon deploy with your unit?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

Answer Choices	Responses			
Yes	42.86%	6		
No	21.43%	3		
N/A, my unit did not deploy	35.71%	5		
otal		14		

Q113: Please rate your SME flight surgeon's performance during deployment in the flowing areas:

Answered: 6 Skipped: 256

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Arranging and ensuring adequate medical support of the squadron	83.33 % 5	16.67 %	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% O	0.00%	6	1.17
Utilizing medical intelligence resources to keep squadron personnel aware of medical threats	83.33 % 5	16.67 %	0.00%	0.00 %	0.00%	0.00%	6	1.17

Q113: Please rate your SME flight surgeon's performance during deployment in the flowing areas: (continued)

Answered: 6 Skipped: 256

Ensuring	83.33%	16.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		
proper deployment sanitation including billeting, food, and water assessment	5	1	0	0	0	0	6	1.1
Readiness for mishaps and disasters (response plans, checklists, and equipment)	83.33% 5	16.67 %	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6	1.1

Q114: Overall, how well prepared is your SME flight surgeon to lead your Squadron Medical Element?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No opinion	Total	Weighted Average
In garrison	42.86 %	42.86% 6	7.14 %	7.14 %	0.00% 0	0.00%	14	1.79
In deployed location	53.85% 7	15.38 %	0.00%	7.69 %	0.00%	23.08 %	13	1.50

Q124: Please rate your attached flight surgeon's depth and breadth of knowledge in the following areas:

Answered: 24 Skipped: 238

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
Operational Issues	20.83 %	41.67%	25.00 %	4.17 %	0.00 %	8.33 %	24	2.14
Flight Safety Issues	33.33 %	41.67% 10	12.50 %	4.17 %	0.00%	8.33 %	24	1.86
Occupational Health	29.17 %	37.50 %	16.67 %	4.17 %	0.00% 0	12.50 %	24	1.95
Medicine and Medical Practice	33.33% 8	41.67% 10	16.67% 4	0.00 %	0.00% 0	8.33 % 2	24	1.83

Generally, it appears as though the Squadron Commanders who have SME flight surgeons view them in a positive, and at the very minimum, non-negative light. By having a more robust reporting structure in the future it will be possible with further iterations of this survey to assess the various perceptions of flight medicine support down to the weapons-system level. Since the last SOFS there have been great strides in imbedding medical assets with the newest special duty operator, the Cyber Warrior. As the Air Force morphs to support a chaotic globe, this is a good place to remind us not to forget those that are constantly deployed in place. This is a call to action for the next bearer of the SOFS torch to include the ISR assets.

Statistical Analysis of Squadron Commander Perception of Flight Surgeon Performance

Questions 101, 102, 116, and 117 were combined in a manner that provides a benchmark by which to judge other associated factors and how they relate to Line commander perception of flight medicine. The raw data and statistical analysis is attached in Appendix C.

The questions were asked to squadron commanders who either interact with an SME flight surgeon or have an attached medical group flight surgeon. It was the intention to evaluate the success of both the SME and attached flight surgeons individually; however, with the limited squadron commander responses it was necessary to combine the SME and attached data to give the best available statistical power to the analysis. The survey questions are displayed below in an alternating pattern to allow for the reader's comparison between the two groups.

Q101: Do you consider your SME flight surgeon to be your personal aeromedical advisor regarding flying safety, human factors and human performance enhancement?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	100.00%	14
No	0.00%	0
Total		14

Q116: Do you consider your attached flight surgeon to be your personal aeromedical advisor regarding flying safety, human factors and human performance enhancement?

Answered: 25 Skipped: 237

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	84.00%	21
No	16.00%	4
Total		25

Q102: Please rate the performance of your SME flight surgeon in this capacity.

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	50.00%	35.71%	7.14%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%		
label)	7	5	1	1	0	0	14	1.7

Q117: Please rate the performance of your attached flight surgeon in this capacity.

Answered: 24 Skipped: 238

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	37.50%	33.33%	20.83%	4.17%	0.00%	4.17%		
label)	9	8	5	1	0	1	24	1.91

Flight Surgeon Attendance of Squadron Commander's Call

Q104: Does your SME flight surgeon attend your Commander's Calls?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

Answer Choices	Responses		
Frequently	71.43%	10	
Occasionally	21.43%	3	
Never	7.14%	11	
Total .		14	

Q118: Does your attached flight surgeon attend your Commander's Calls?

Answered: 25 Skipped: 237

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	48.00%	12
Occasionally	32.00%	8
Never	20.00%	5
Total		25

A KWALLIS analysis was performed on the responses to questions 104 and 118. These results were matched by Respondent ID to the performance benchmark (Questions 101, 102, 116, and 117).

-	
K (Observed value)	9.862
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.007
alpha	0.05

It was determined that there was a difference among the reported perception in the benchmark question when the data was stratified by commander's call attendance of frequently, occasionally, and never. The KWALLIS results caused me to reject the null hypothesis of H0: Flight surgeon Commander's Call attendance is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon. (K=9.862, p=0.007)

A two-tailed t comparison was performed to evaluate the differences among the three groups. A Bonferroni correction was performed and yielded the following results:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Frequently	1	0.961	0.003
Occasionally	0.961	1	0.005
Never	0.003	0.005	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.0167

Significant differences:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Frequently	No	No	Yes
Occasionally	No	No	Yes
Never	Yes	Yes	No

There was found to be no significant difference in the commanders' perception of those flight surgeons who attended commander's calls frequently verses occasionally; however, there is a significant difference between those that attended frequently verses never and occasionally verses never. The important factor is that they were attended at all.

The result is that attendance of an operational squadron commander's call is associated with being more favorably viewed in the performance of flight surgeon duties.

Flight Surgeon Attendance of Flight Safety Meetings

Q105: Does your SME flight surgeon attend your Flight Safety meetings/briefings?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	85.71%	12
Occasionally	7.14%	1
Never	7.14%	.1
Total		14

Q119: Does your attached flight surgeon attend your Flight Safety meetings/briefings?

Answered: 25 Skipped: 237

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	48.00%	12
Occasionally	36.00%	9
Never	16.00%	4
otal		25

A KWALLIS analysis was performed on the responses to questions 105 and 119. These results were matched by Respondent ID to the performance benchmark (Questions 101, 102, 116, and 117).

K (Observed value)	11.096
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.004
alpha	0.05

It was determined that there was a difference among the reported perception in the benchmark question when the data was stratified by flight safety meeting attendance of frequently, occasionally, and never. The KWALLIS results caused me to reject the null hypothesis of H0: Flight Safety meeting participation is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon. (K=11.096, p=0.004)

A two-tailed t comparison was performed to evaluate the differences among the three groups. A Bonferroni correction was performed and yielded the following results:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Frequently	1	0.458	0.001
Occasionally	0.458	1	0.010
Never	0.001	0.010	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.0167

Significant differences:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never
Frequently	No	No	Yes
Occasionally	No	No	Yes
Never	Yes	Yes	No

There was found to be no significant difference in the commanders' perception of those flight surgeons who attended flight safety meetings frequently verses occasionally; however, there is a significant difference between those that attended frequently verses never and occasionally verses never. Aside from the fact that it is mandatory that all aircrew attend quarterly flight safety meetings, the important factor is that they were attended at all.

The result is that attendance of flight safety meetings is associated with being more favorably viewed in the performance of flight surgeon duties.

Quality of Flight Surgeon Briefing Presentations

Q106: Does your SME flight surgeon present aeromedical, flight safety or general safety topics at Commander's Calls and/or Flight Safety meetings/briefings?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	92.86%	13
No	7.14%	1
Unsure	0.00%	0
Fotal .		14

Q107: Please rate your SME flight surgeon's advice to you and your squadron leadership regarding medical, environmental and operational factors that influence war fighter effectiveness and mission completion.

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	50.00%	42.86%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%		
label)	7	6	0	1	0	0	14	1.6

Q120: Does your attached flight surgeon present aeromedical, flight safety or general safety topics at Commander's Calls and/or Flight Safety meetings/briefings?

Answered: 25 Skipped: 237

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	36.00%	9
Occasionally	44.00%	11
Never	20.00%	5
Total		25

Q121: Please rate your attached flight surgeon's advice to you and your squadron leadership regarding medical, environmental and operational factors that influence war fighter effectiveness and mission completion.

Answered: 24 Skipped: 238

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Total	Weighted Average
(no	29.17%	37.50%	20.83%	8.33%	0.00%	4.17%		
label)	7	9	5	2	0	1	24	2.09

A KWALLIS analysis was performed on the responses to questions 107 and 121. These results were matched by Respondent ID to the performance benchmark (Questions 101, 102, 116, and 117).

K (Observed value)	18.275
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-	
tailed)	0.000
alpha	0.05

It was determined that there was a difference among the reported perception in the benchmark question when the data was stratified by quality of flight surgeon briefing: superior, excellent, and good. The KWALLIS results caused me to reject the null hypothesis of H0: Quality of briefing presentation is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon. (K=18.275, p=0.000)

A two-tailed t comparison was performed to evaluate the differences among the three groups. A Bonferroni correction was performed and yielded the following results:

	Superior	Excellent	Good
Superior	1	0.002	0.000
Excellent	0.002	1	0.078
Good	0.000	0.078	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.0167

Significant differences:

	Superior	Excellent	Good
Superior	No	Yes	Yes
Excellent	Yes	No	No
Good	Yes	No	No

There was found to be no significant difference in the commanders' perception of those flight surgeons who briefed excellent verses good quality presentations; however, there is a significant difference between those that briefed superior verses excellent and superior verses good. When delivering information regardless of the forum, one should convey the information in such a way to instill confidence. The commander doesn't know that the flight surgeon may be a brilliant physician, the commander only knows how the information is being presented. If he or she trusts the deliverer of the message, then the message is received with more credence.

The result is that delivering high quality briefings is associated with being more favorably viewed in the performance of flight surgeon duties.

Flight Surgeon Performance of Regular Flying Duties

Q109: Does your SME flight surgeon fly regularly and frequently with your squadron?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	71.43%	10
No	28.57%	4
Total		14

Q122: Does your attached flight surgeon fly regularly and frequently with your squadron?

Answered: 24 Skipped: 238

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	66.67%	16
No	29.17%	7
No, the attached flight surgeon is not on flying status	0.00%	0
N/A	4.17%	1
Total		24

A KWALLIS analysis was performed on the responses to questions 109 and 122. These results were matched by Respondent ID to the performance benchmark (Questions 101, 102, 116, and 117).

K (Observed	
value)	1.574
K (Critical value)	3.841
DF	1
p-value (Two-	
tailed)	0.210
alpha	0.05

It was determined that there is no statistical difference among the reported perception in the benchmark question when the data was stratified by performance of regular flying duties with the squadron. The KWALLIS results caused me to fail to reject the null hypothesis of H0 Regular flying is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon. (K=1.574, p=0.210)

The result is that the performance of regular flying duties with the squadron is no associated with being more favorably viewed in the performance of flight surgeon duties. That having been said,

there are several comments from this survey that point to the availability of the flight surgeon outside of the clinic makes more honest interactions likely to occur.

Flight Surgeon Attendance of Squadron Social Functions

Q110: Is your SME flight surgeon involved in squadron social functions?

Answered: 14 Skipped: 248

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	71.43%	10
Occasionally	21.43%	3
Never	7.14%	1
Total		14

Q123: Is your attached flight surgeon involved in squadron social functions?

Answered: 24 Skipped: 238

Answer Choices	Responses	
Frequently	33.33%	8
Occasionally	41.67%	10
Never	25.00%	6
Total		24

A KWALLIS analysis was performed on the responses to questions 110 and 123. These results were matched by Respondent ID to the performance benchmark (Questions 101, 102, 116, and 117).

K (Observed value)	11.753
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-	
tailed)	0.003
alpha	0.05

It was determined that there was a difference among the reported perception in the benchmark question when the data was stratified by social function attendance of frequently, occasionally, and never. The KWALLIS results caused me to reject the null hypothesis of H0: Social event participation is

associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon. (K=11.753, p=0.003)

A two-tailed t comparison was performed to evaluate the differences among the three groups. A Bonferroni correction was performed and yielded the following results:

	Frequent	Occasional	Never	
Frequent	1		0.112	0.001
Occasional	0.112		1	0.037
Never	0.001		0.037	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.0167

Significant differences:

	Frequent	Occasional	Never	
Frequent	No	No	Yes	
Occasional	No	No	No	
Never	Yes	No	No	

There was found to be no significant difference in the commanders' perception of those flight surgeons who attended squadron social function frequently verses occasionally nor occasionally verses never; however, there is a significant difference between those that attended frequently verses never. In order to evaluate the differences among commander's call attendance verses non-attendance a Mann-U-Whitney analysis was performed.

U	23.000
Expected value	90.000
Variance (U)	486.429
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.003
alpha	0.05

When the data for frequent and occasional social function attendance was combined, there was a statistical difference of commander's perception of the flight surgeon's performance. (p=0.003)

The result is that attendance of squadron social functions is associated with being more favorably viewed in the performance of flight surgeon duties. The benefit of social function attendance is two-fold. First it allows the flight surgeon to be visible to the squadron members and their families. By being approachable, you are building a rapport that will pay dividends in the clinic. Secondly, by seeing the aircrew in their natural habitat, a flight surgeon can readily identify and more easily course-correct emerging harmful social trends within the unit.

Weaknesses

Weaknesses of this study as in the past included an imprecise technique to invite commanders to participate in the survey. The total responses were significantly down from previous SOFS and the calculation a denominator of each commander type is a daunting task, preventing a reasonable survey return rate from being formed.

I echo the recommendations from the previous survey that if using this MAJCOM SGP approach, one should start communicating with the MAJCOMs optimally three months before the survey launch date. It would have been beneficial to have the actual OG and squadron commander names.

Another design consideration as mentioned earlier would be to specifically include the ISR platforms and those flight surgeons embedded within. Expansion of these would provide better resolution of what types of squadron weapon systems we are serving and would reduce the number of "Other" responses, which is currently capturing these commanders. Additionally, including a free text box for "Other" responses could have helped future surveys.

Closing

This is a call to action for the vision of the survey to continue. If there is anyone who would take up this task, please email me on Global or send me a personal email: matthew.h.ramage@gmail.com

I will be happy to help navigate you through the process of survey design, approval, and distribution. I will be saving all of the raw data so that a longitudinal comparison can be made from year to year with similar questions.

Overall, the Line appreciates flight medicine and wants us around. It is our responsibility to follow in the footsteps of those before us and keep the tradition of Line support in the Air Force alive. Lest we forget our roles and retire to our clinic offices to perform work that is comfortable, the flight surgeon will fade into obscurity as a footnote in the annals of military medical history. I leave with a final thought; the purpose of a flight surgeon is simple...to be there.

Stercus accidit!

Matt "SNIPEr" Ramage RAM XV

Acknowledgments

I want to thank Colonel Robert York as well as the unnamed RAM mafia that helped me with getting the SOFS back to the light of day. For those of you that have never navigated the world of survey control...it is a daunting task to say the least.

Appendix A: Comments

Flight Doc(s) brief at our weekly OG Staff meetings almost every week! Great support! Drs. K and H are AWESOME!!!!

Hard to schedule due to high/unpredictable ops tempo in flying squadron and low flight surgeon manning/high workload.

I have a Flight Surgeon that is assigned/resides/deploys with my squadron. The briefing content is not as important as the rapport/trust that she builds with my troops. Very effective at making them feel comfortable enough to seek medical treatment.

I meet both formally and informally with the Flt Surgeon multiple times per week. I am answering these questions based on that interaction, and not necessarily briefs he gives to the entire sq.

My Flight Surgeon tailors his information according to the meeting's intent and it has created a great dialogue between my Group's Sq/CCs and the Flight Medicine office.

Obviously the quality of the briefing depends upon the individual some Flight Docs provide high quality briefings, others not so much. I've never seen a marginal or poor quality briefing from a flight doc.

Our flight doc is very proactive and is a definite asset to the squadron.

The briefings are 100% predictable and follow the "standard" formula/cookbook approach so the audience is desensitized. I think they could be very powerful but we miss the opportunity for the easy out.

We had a great relationship with our attached flight doc until he was deployed. Can't wait until he gets back!

We hold infrequent CC calls in the OSS. However, our flt surgeons are VERY engaged with our controller and pilot issues. They have frequent contact with me and with the member. Most of the squadron interaction occurs at the flight level on a monthly basis. There aren't sufficient topics that warrant taking a flight doc off the line to provide a briefing at these calls. I relay critical information as soon as I get it.

A flight surgeon in an RPA squadron is a unique relationship. He cannot fly with us, therefore flies with the ANG HH-60 squadron here.

A lot of our personnel end up seeing a PA primarily with a Flight Surgeon review of their case.

Always very responsive when called but always need to show up to scene if called in for an IFE....

Biggest problem is the lack of them. The numbers seem to ebb and flow and we seem healthy right now, but due to an influx of fairly new, inexperienced guys.

Both "X" L and "X" A do an outstanding job as flight surgeons. They would and have done everything to take care of fliers and their families. I assume it is tougher for them to get more cockpit time due to the fact that we only fly a single seat aircraft, and I would like to see them get more time flying so they can even better relate to us.

Cannot complain about any of the XAFB flight surgeons

"X" K & H & F are Fantastic!!!

Doc L has been very responsive to the needs of the Squadron and does all he can to ensure we meet our flying mission.

Families find it difficult to get appointments guickly when family members are sick.

Flight Medicine should see all flyer's dependents.

Flight surgeons don't see family members. Flight docs much too lenient when putting people on medical/fitness profiles. Our younger Airmen (TSgt and below) know how easy it is to get a fitness test

exemption. You're killing us - 35% of my squadron is chronically exempt from fitness test components. Stop babying the force.

Flight surgeons need to spend more time in the squadron. In my opinion, the flight surgeon should be assigned to the squadron to facilitate better interaction.

Flt Docs are not as present as I have seen at other bases. In general, this does not increase trust between pilot and Doc.

Good manning increase to account for pilot manning. Paperwork for waivers and other issues used to be lost on a regular basis, but since a large influx of new flight docs - this has diminished greatly. I am very satisfied with our flight docs. They try their very best to accommodate for mission completion.

I did not answer the question on Family Care because we just transitioned family care to the flight medicine clinic last week and do not have the data yet. Also, the answers on quality of flight surgeon is a little misleading. I am an OG/CC so I am rating multiple flight surgeons. Generally, they are very good flight surgeons across the board and I am very satisfied. However, the ratings will vary by individual doctor.

I do not have an assigned flight surgeon. I'm in a foreign squadron

I, and my squadron, are not privileged enough to see flight surgeons. We see whoever has time for us that day in family practice.

I'm an A-10 Commander - unable to assess my Flt/Doc's flying ability since he's not flying with our unit. Maj C is a superior FLT surgeon. He knows perfectly how to balance medical requirements and mission achievement. BRAVO!

Manning!!!! We cannot have 5 priorities that are all #1, same goes for flight medicine. We need to stop doing the "nice to have" and focus on the "must do."

My assigned flight surgeon is outstanding--she has built a rapport/level of trust with my troops, their families, and the squadron leadership that allows her to provide calibrated treatment that maximizes my squadron's operational effectiveness. While there are other outstanding flight surgeons in the Wing, they are poorly led, are discouraged from communicating their concerns to and seeking advice from squadron leadership, they author and enforce policies that are arbitrary instead of treatment-based with little concern for long-term operational impacts and little incentive to make better policy, they are not team players and purposely/routinely undermine my troops' trust and my efforts to provide them the long term care they need.

My assigned flight surgeon is phenomenal about keeping me up to date on DNIF status, waiver processes, and ways ahead to keep flyers flying.

My fliers are complaining about the scheduling/availability of the flight med clinic. there seems to be a need for remedial training for the scheduling/appointment NCOs.

Our flight surgeon situation has improved dramatically in the last 9 months. Availability and quality of care have increased and the flight surgeons have been able to fly on a somewhat regular basis which is very important in building credibility with aircrew. Very pleased with our current flight surgeons!

Our flight surgeons have been woefully under-staffed for most of my 9 months on-station. That recently improved, so we JUST started seeing a flight doc fly with us about a month ago. FYI, the one doc on base who does Osteopathic Manipulation provides a PHENOMINAL capability to the pilots in terms of preventative healthcare, reducing pain, increasing mobility, which all equates directly to improving mission success. His ability to provide OMT has been on the chopping block multiple times and the number of available time slots he is able to provide is nowhere near what the demand is. At XAFB, the on-staff Chiropractor did the same. With a pilot population numbering around 500, I really wish the medical community would provide more support in this arena. Many pilots pay out-of-pocket to go to chiropractors but I get the impression the AD (i.e. mission needs) often take a back seat to other demands/metrics (retired patients, dependents, and sheer volume of patients seen--which drives

down availability for OMT). The Dr who does provide OMT is not a flight surgeon, but I know of no better direct positive impact to the flying mission, that does not involve meds and specialists (\$\$), than that skill. We need more of it.

Our flight surgeons started an initiative on human performance but they need better resources. They should do some type of human performance training (brief) in all mission briefs they fly on. Also I would like to see all flying squadrons to have their own SME doc with an IDMT that is not roped into med group work.

Our flt docs have a great grassroots approach to addressing the members' and their families' concerns. They balance operational need with flying safety and are knowledgeable, professional, and personable. I wish we could fly them more. The staffing levels of our flight medicine clinic only recently got corrected. At the busiest pilot training base in the AF (XAFB) where about 30% of pilots are trained, we had a 7-month period where we essentially had 1 clinician/flight surgeon. This was unsatisfactory in terms of manning other units/bases first. At an officer flying tech school base, we have more aviators here than at most other bases. 1 body = inadequate. Now, the 4 folks appear to be the right amount. Small base but some of the most outstanding care I have seen in 18 years.

The only reason I downgraded our flight doc is that she is a new flight surgeon and is quickly learning our mission and flight surgeon requirements.

The primary issue I have with flight surgeons at this base are three fold. First, lack of follow through when dealing with airman. They do not communicate or explain the ramifications of conditions and courses of treatment to airman. Second, a general lack of professionalism and condescension in dealing with flight surgeons. They are in the uniformed services and, while specialists, still should adhere to basic customs and courtesies. Third, a lack of interest in caring for the airman. They do not explain situations well or present alternatives. They rarely display any concern about the airman beyond getting them out of the office and closing the appt. These are general comments and I have met exceptions but I feel that as a rule the above comments are justified and proven true in most cases.

They are excellent and have made strides to get info to our squadron. We are adding them to CC briefs but have not yet had time due to TDY and training events.

Unit assigned Flight Surgeon and medical technicians are invaluable with providing responsive care and meeting administrative needs. They have a great network within the MDG as well as HQ.

We were severely undermanned on flight surgeons, until just recently. There were serious morale problems with our flight surgeons which seemed to stem from the fact that the chief doctor holds the keys to the docs licenses but their boss, with a nursing background does not. There have been personnel changes that have improved the situation, but it seems like the current setup lends itself to this conflict of interests.

We've had a difficult time flying our flight surgeon b/c he arrived at XAB without requisite SERE training. Recommend some way of getting AF flight surgeons at least level B SERE. Level C is the standard for CENTCOM though. Maj G, ##ERQS, XAF, AFG. DSN ###-#### Thanks

Member has been in process of separation since he returned. Mind appears elsewhere.

My Flt Surgeon is very new to the Air Force. While knowledge of AF operations is limited, he is extremely eager to learn and motivated to perform to expectations.

Our flight surgeon deployed with the XXFS and received rave reviews for her performance. I'm confident she would do very well with the XXX ARS.

She's outstanding. Makes up for the rest of the Wing's Medical Group.

Again, we only recently gained a flight surgeon who started flying with us a month ago. Up until now, I haven't seen one in the squadron. He might participate and change my answers to this section in the future but I don't expect it or count on it.

My attached flt doc is very new, but doing his very best to get on the step. He's motivated to take care of the squadron's needs. I am very satisfied.

Students are able to manipulate the DNIF system with relative ease in order to game the system and thereby navigate SUPT in a way that works to their advantage. Most students do not do this, but some do; the standard safeguards used for AD pilots are insufficient to account for the student that goes "strategic DNIF"--this seems to be an area that could be improved.

They seem like good guys, they just seem too busy to ever be in the squadron on a regular basis. Result is most pilots have no idea who they are, and as a result, are unlikely to trust them.

They should be trained to do FAA physicals and do them regularly. It is important for them to know all flying standards.

Very happy with the lean forward, mission-oriented focus of Doc L!

Appendix B: Survey Questions

Welcome

The US Air Force is committed to maintaining the readiness of the professional Airmen who serve this nation. The Air Force's ability to consistently answer the call of duty includes a focus on health of our airmen. Ultimately, it is the health of our force that will maximize readiness and mission success.

The US Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine is partnering with the Air Force Survey Office to gather information from selected line leadership and flight surgeons regarding the professional performance and satisfaction of our flight surgeons in the field. We need your help in this partnership.

This survey is completely anonymous and will take 7 to 10 minutes to complete. Your repliers will enable the Air Force to better serve its Airmen and maximize force readiness to meet unique mission requirement of the 21st century.

Thank you in advance for your time.

**This survey has been approved by the United States Air Force Survey Center. Survey Control Number 16-XXX.

1.	Pleas	se pick	the	categor	y(ies)	that	best	des	cribe	(s) you:

Flight Surgeon

Line Officer- Commander

None of the above

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

Flight Surgeon

Page 61 1

	2. What is your primary Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC)?
	A. 48G (General Medical Officer Flight Surgeon)
	B. 48R (Residency Trained Flight Surgeon)
	C. 48A (Aerospace Medicine Specialist)
	D. 40C0C (Medical Commander, Medical)
	3. Does this AFSC match your primary duties?
	Yes
	O No
k	4. Which of the following describes your <u>current</u> primary job or position? (Check all that apply)
	A. Squadron Medical Element Flight Surgeon
	B. Medical Treatment Facility Flight Surgeon
	D. Medical Treatment Facility Flight Gargeon
	C. Flight Commander
	C. Flight Commander
	C. Flight Commander D. Squadron Commander
	C. Flight Commander D. Squadron Commander E. Medical Treatment Facility Commander

Page 62 2

5. Which aerospace medicine jobs/positions have you held?(Check all that apply)
A. Squadron Medical Element Flight Surgeon
B. Medical Treatment Facility Flight Surgeon
C. Chief of Aerospace Medicine (SGP)
D. Flight Commander
E. Squadron Commander
F. Group Commander
G. MAJCOM Aerospace Medicine Staff
H. MAJCOM Chief of Aerospace Medicine
I. AF/SG Aerospace Medicine Staff
J. AF/SG Chief of Aerospace Medicine
K. USAFSAM Staff/Instructor
L. USAFSAM Staff/Clinical
M. Other Staff (IG, AFSA, SGX, etc.)
N. Other operational (Pilot-Physician, NASA, etc.)
6. I am currently or have been assigned as a flight surgeon with my primary aircraft of assignment being a fighter/attack major weapons system.
Yes
○ No
7. Are you board-certified in Aerospace Medicine?
Yes
○ No

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

Page 63 3

Residency in Aer	ed or board-eligible in Aero ospace Medicine?	space medicine, now i	ong ago did you gra	duate from the OSAF
A. < 1 year ago				
B. 1-5 years ago	0			
C. 6-10 years a	go			
D. >10 years ag	10			
E. I am board-o	ertified/eligible in Aerospace Med	licine, but not a USAFSAM	RAM graduate.	
F. I am not a gra	aduate of a Residency in Aerospa	ace Medicine.		
9. The USAF Res	sidency in Aerospace Medi	cine prepared me well	for my duties as an	Aerospace Medicine
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		O		
10. Are you board Yes No	d-certified in a medical spe	cialty other than Aeros	space Medicine?	
Yes No	medical specialty(s) are yo		space Medicine?	
Yes No 11. In what other (Check all that ap	medical specialty(s) are yo		space Medicine?	
Yes No 11. In what other (Check all that ap	medical specialty(s) are yo oply) sine (Family Practice)		space Medicine?	
Yes No 11. In what other (Check all that ap A. Family Medic	medical specialty(s) are yo oply) sine (Family Practice)		space Medicine?	
Yes No No 11. In what other (Check all that ap A. Family Medic B. Internal Medic	medical specialty(s) are yo oply) sine (Family Practice)		space Medicine?	
Yes No No 11. In what other (Check all that applications) A. Family Medications B. Internal Medications C. Pediatrics	medical specialty(s) are youngerly) sine (Family Practice) cine		space Medicine?	
Yes No No 11. In what other (Check all that applications) A. Family Medications B. Internal Medications C. Pediatrics D. Surgery	medical specialty(s) are younged		space Medicine?	
Yes No No 11. In what other (Check all that applications) A. Family Medications B. Internal Medications C. Pediatrics D. Surgery E. Occupational	medical specialty(s) are younged		space Medicine?	

Page 64

4

12. I have moved approxima	ately every ye	ars since becoming a	ı flight surgeon.	
A. 1				
B. 2				
C. 3				
D. 4				
E. 5+				
F. N/A				
2016 State of the Flight	Surgeon			
13. How long ago did you gr	aduate from the Aer	ospace Medicine Prir	nary (AMP) Course	e?
A. < 1 year ago				
B. 1-5 years ago				
C. 6-10 years ago				
D. > 10 years ago				
2016 State of the Flight	Surgeon			
Flight Surgeon Training				
14. The Aerospace Medicine		•	•	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. Sustainment and refresh maintain the skills I need to	=	ole after the Aerospa	ce Medicine Primar	ry (AMP) Course to
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
C. S	9.00		2.55.3.5	3.13.13.1 210dg100

Page 65 5

Disagree (ATLS) Trainin	Strongly Disagree
	ng.
	ng.
my rooponaih	
my rooponoih	
my rosponsih	
Tilly responsib	ilities as a flight
n and Preventi	ion (AMIP) Course.
	n and Preventi

Page 66 6

21. As a flight surgoon, I have attended the Clabel Medicine Course
21. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Global Medicine Course. Yes
○ No
NO NO
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
2010 State of the Flight Surgeon
22. I found the Global Medicine Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.
Yes
O No
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
23. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Advanced Clinical Concepts in Aeromedical Evacuation (ACCAE) Course.
Yes
○ No
○ No
O No 2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon 24. I found the Advanced Clinical Concepts in Aeromedical Evacuation (ACCAE) Course beneficial to my

Page 67 7

	25. As a flight ourgoon, I have attended the Contingency Proventive Medicine (CDM) Course
	25. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Contingency Preventive Medicine (CPM) Course.
	Yes
	○ No
i	
	2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
	26. I found the Contingency Preventive Medicine (CPM) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.
	Yes
	○ No
	2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
	27. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Occupational Medicine Course.
	Yes
	○ No
	2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
	28. I found the Occupational Medicine Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.
	Yes
	○ No

Page 68 8

29. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Human Performance Enhancement (HPE) Course. Yes No
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
30. I found the Human Performance Enhancement (HPE) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon. Yes
○ No
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
31. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Critical Care Air Transport Team (CCATT) Course. Yes No
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
32. I found the Critical Care Air Transport Team (CCATT) Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon. Yes No

Page 69 9

22. As a flight ourgoon, I have attended the Tan Knife Course
33. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Top Knife Course. Yes
○ No
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
34. I found the Top Knife Course beneficial to my responsibilities as a flight surgeon.
Yes
○ No
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
35. As a flight surgeon, I have attended the Chief of Aeromedical Services and Advanced Flight Surgeon Symposium (SGP Course).
Yes
○ No
2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
36. I found the Chief of Aeromedical Services and Advanced Flight Surgeon Symposium (SGP Course) beneficial to my responsibilities as an SGP or senior flight surgeon.
Yes
○ No

Page 70 10

2016 State of the	Flight Surge	eon					
Deployment							
37. I have been dep	oloved ma	onths in the past th	ree vears.				
37. I have been deployed months in the past three years.							
1-4							
5-8							
9-12							
>12							
2016 State of the	Flight Surge	on					
2010 State of the	i ligili odige						
38. I was well traine	d to perform the	patient care dutie	s required of me	while deployed.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A		
20 Mustaninina ada		d to			المحددة المحادمة		
			-	tasks required of me w			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A		
40. My family was p	repared for my	deployment.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A		
41. My family was w							
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A		
42. While deployed	the right equipm	nent was available	for my team.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A		

2016 State of the Flig	ht Surgeon				
43. While deployed	the equipment v	vas in good repair	for my team.		
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
44. My support staff	was well traine	d for the deployme	nt mission.		
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
45. I deployed with t					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
2016 State of the	Flight Surge	on			
	_		_		_
Job					
46. The most import	tant mentor(s) I	have had in mv mi	litary career has	been the following:	
(Check all that apply		,	,	.	
Supervisors/Comm	anders				
Instructors/professo	ors				
Senior 4F0Xs					
Peers					
Other leaders					
I have not been me	entored well				
47 I have the great	act difficulty or f	aal most uncomfor	tahla with		
47. I have the greate	est unificulty of to	eei most uncomior	ומטו ט שונוז		
Medical skills					
Administrative requ	irements				
Accomplishing flyin	g events				
Officership/military	personnel requirem	ents			

Deployed operations

Page 72 12

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon 48. The top three barriers to performing my job are: (Choose three) Training Staff Guidance Leadership Equipment/Space 49. I am well trained to perform patient care duties expected of me. Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree Agree 50. I am well trained to perform operational/deployment support tasking. Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree 51. I am well trained to perform command and leadership functions expected of me. Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree Agree 52. I plan to become a medical leader in the Air Force (commander, command surgeon, etc.). Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree N/A Agree 53. I feel properly trained to do my job well. Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree N/A

55. The Air Force provides me with adequate guidance to do my job well. Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree N/A Page 73

Disagree

Neutral

54. I have the tools and equipment to do my job well.

Agree

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

N/A

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon 56. My enlisted support staff is trained and sufficient to help me do my job well. Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Neutral N/A Disagree 57. My leadership supports me and encourages me to do my job well. Strongly Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree N/A Agree 58. The environment I work in today is friendlier now than three years ago. Strongly Agree Neutral Strongly Disagree N/A Agree Disagree 59. I enjoy being a flight surgeon in the Air Force. Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree N/A

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

Job

60.	I plan to stay in the USAF for the following term:
	Only for my training commitment
	Beyond my training commitment but short of retirement eligibility
	Just until retirement eligibility
	Past retirement eligibility

Page 74 14

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon
1. What are the top 3 things
Choose three)

61. What are the top 3 things keeping you in the aerospace medicine career field? (Choose three)	
Military family lifestyle	
Flying/operational opportunities	
Deployment opportunities	
Clinical environment	
Future military opportunities (command, promotion)	
Future civilian jobs unattractive	
Pay/bonuses	
Recession	
Other	
62. If you plan to leave the USAF before retirement eligibility, which factors most influenced this decision	?
(Check all that apply)	
Personal/family reasons	
Personal/family reasons	
Personal/family reasons Civilian employment opportunities	
Personal/family reasons Civilian employment opportunities Deployments/ops tempo	
Personal/family reasons Civilian employment opportunities Deployments/ops tempo Dissatisfaction with work	
Personal/family reasons Civilian employment opportunities Deployments/ops tempo Dissatisfaction with work Electronic medical record (AHLTA)	
Personal/family reasons Civilian employment opportunities Deployments/ops tempo Dissatisfaction with work Electronic medical record (AHLTA) Future military opportunities unclear	
Personal/family reasons Civilian employment opportunities Deployments/ops tempo Dissatisfaction with work Electronic medical record (AHLTA) Future military opportunities unclear Future military jobs unattractive	

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

Page 75 15

63. The following factors are important considerations to my remaining in the Air Force:

Stro	ngly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagre	N/A
Opportunity to fly						0
Financial compensation						
Professional autonomy	0		0	0	0	0
Confidence in leadership						
Input into the assignment process			0			
Time available to take leave						
Sense of duty				0		0
Quality work environment						
Health benefits for the family					0	
Lifestyle						
Frequency of PCS	0					
Frequency of deployments						
Length of deployments						
Unique challenges of aerospace medicine						
016 State of the Fligh	nt Surgeon					
amily						
4. My family's healthcare,		-				N/A
Strongly Agree Ag	gree	Neutral	Disagree	e Stror	ngly Disagree	N/A
5. My spouse has been a	ble to maintai	in a satisfyir	ng career while	I have been	on active duty.	
Strongly Agree Ag	gree	Neutral	Disagree	e Stror	ngly Disagree	N/A

Page 76 16

2016 State of the Flig	ht Surgeon				
66. My family is sup	portive of my Air	Force career.			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
2016 State of the	Flight Surge	on			
Organizational Su	ıpport				
67. The Aerospace development.	Medical Associa	ion (AsMA) annua	l meeting is valu	able for my profession	al
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
68. The Association professional developed Strongly Agree		eons of the U.S. (A	MSUS) annual r Disagree	neeting is valuable for Strongly Disagree	my N/A
69. Which Society o	of USAF Flight Su	urgeons products/e	events do you fin	d useful? (Check all th	at apply)
Flight Surgeon's Ch	necklist				
Aircraft Mishap Inve	estigation Handbook				
Flight Surgeons To	olkit (CD-ROM)				
FlightLines (Newsle	etter)				
Website					
SOUSAFFS lunche	eon (at AsMA annual	meeting)			
SOUSAFFS social	(at AsMA annual me	eting)			
I do not find any of	the listed products/e	vents useful			
I have not used or a	attended any of the I	isted products/events			
2016 State of the	Flight Surge	on			

Commanders

Page 77 17

2046 61-1	£ 4 l	FILE LA C.	
2016 Stat	e or the	Filloint Si	
Lo 10 Otal		I ligit o	ar goor

70 5 5 11					.	
70. Do your flight surgappropriate venues?	geons speak to y	your personnel at	safety briefings,	Commander's C	calls, or other	
Frequent	ly	Occasi	onally		Never	
2016 State of the	Flight Surgeo	n				
71. Please rate the in	npact of these bi	riefings on your m	ission.			
Strong Positive Impact	Positive Impa			egative Impact	Strong Negative Impact	
72. Please rate the or	verall quality of t	hese briefings.				
Exceptional Quality	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Exceptional Quality	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Exceptional Quality Optional Comments	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
	High Quality	Adequate Quality	Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
			Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Optional Comments			Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Optional Comments			Marginal Quality	Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Optional Comments 2016 State of the	Flight Surgeo	n		Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Optional Comments 2016 State of the 1 73. Do your flight sure	Flight Surgeo	n		Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Optional Comments 2016 State of the 73. Do your flight sure Yes	Flight Surgeo	n		Poor Quality	No Opinion	
Optional Comments 2016 State of the 1 73. Do your flight sure	Flight Surgeo	n		Poor Quality	No Opinion	

Page 78 18

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

4. How credible do yo	our flyers consi					
Superior	Excellent		Good	Fair		Poor
5. Please rate your fli	ight surgeons in	n terms of leve	el of respect a	accorded them	as aircrew.	
Superior	Excellent		Good	Fair		Poor
How 'easy' or 'toug alance flying safety, t	-	-			•	-
Overly Restric	-		bout Right	ni, and appropr	Overly Permiss	
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				5.110
016 State of the F	liaht Suraeo	n				
7. Please rate your fli	ight surgeons' (communicatio	n skills and ef	forts.		
7. Please rate your fli Superior	ight surgeons' (Excellent	communicatio	n skills and ef Good	forts. Fair		Poor
-		communicatio				Poor
-		communicatio				Poor
Superior	Excellent		Good	Fair	e in the followin	
Superior	Excellent		Good	Fair	e in the following Very Dissatisfied	g areas:
Superior Superior	Excellent onstallation flight	surgeons' de	Good oth and bread	Fair Ith of knowledg		g areas:
Superior 8. Please rate your in Operational Issues	Excellent onstallation flight	surgeons' de	Good oth and bread	Fair Ith of knowledg		g areas:
Superior 8. Please rate your in Operational Issues Flight Safety Issues	Excellent onstallation flight	surgeons' de	Good oth and bread	Fair Ith of knowledg		g areas:
Superior 8. Please rate your in Operational Issues Flight Safety Issues Occupational Health	Excellent Installation flight Very Satisfied	surgeons' de	Good oth and bread	Fair Ith of knowledg		g areas:
Superior 8. Please rate your in Operational Issues Flight Safety Issues Occupational Health	Excellent Installation flight Very Satisfied	surgeons' de	Good oth and bread	Fair Ith of knowledg		
Superior 8. Please rate your in Operational Issues Flight Safety Issues Occupational Health General Medical Practice 9. Please rate your le	Excellent Installation flight Very Satisfied	surgeons' dep	Good Oth and bread Neutral	Fair O O O Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	g areas: No Opinior
Superior 8. Please rate your in Operational Issues Flight Safety Issues Occupational Health General Medical Practice 9. Please rate your le	Excellent Installation flight Very Satisfied	surgeons' dep	Good Oth and bread Neutral	Fair O O O Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	g areas: No Opinior
8. Please rate your in	Excellent Installation flight Very Satisfied Output Output	surgeons' del	Good Oth and bread Neutral Oth Oth and bread Oth Oth and bread Oth	Fair O O O Dissatisfied O O cled preparedne	Very Dissatisfied	g areas: No Opinion

Page 79 19

80.	Please	provide v	vour	overall	rating	of '	vour fliah	it surgeons'	impact	on:
-	i ioaco		y Oui	OVCIUII	IGUIIG	01	your mign	t ourgoons	IIIIpaot	. 01

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No Opinion
Flying Safety						
Mission Completion						
81. Do the families of	your flyers obta	in their basic ı	medical care	orimarily at the	Flight Medicine	Clinic?
Yes						
No						
No, our Flight Medicin	e Clinic does not se	ee dependents				
2016 State of the F	light Surgeo	n				
82. How well do your t	fliaht suraeons r	meet the famil	ies' health ca	re needs?		
Superior	Excellent		Good	Fair		Poor
				0		
2016 State of the F	light Surgeo	n				
83. Are there any add or otherwise?	itional comment	s that you wis	h to make ab	out your flight s	urgeons, positiv	ve, negative
* 84. Please select the	description that	applies.				
I am a/an:						
Operations Group Cor	mmander					
Squadron Commande	r					
None of the above						

Page 80 20

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

Operations Group Commanders

This group of questions concerns specifically the flight surgeon who is the Chief of Aeromedical Services (SGP) at your installation. This is frequently a different individual than the Aeromedical Squadron Commander, particularly when the latter is not a flight surgeon.

ob. How long have you been, or were you, an operations group commander?
Less than 6 months
6- 12 Months
13-18 Months
19- 24 Months
Greater than 24 Months
86. For which weapon systems are your operations group responsible?
Airborne Command and Control
Attack/ Fighter
Bomber
Cargo
High Performance Trainer
Heavy Trainer
Air Reconnaissance
Helicopter
Missile and/or Launch Ops
RPA RPA
ISR/Cyber
Other
87. Do you consider your SGP to be your primary aeromedical advisor regarding flight or missile crew
medical issues, flying safety, human factors and human performance enhancement?
Yes
○ No

Page 81 21

88. Please rate the	e performance of y	our Chief of Aeron	nedical Services (SGP) in this capa	ıcity.
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
89. Does your Chi	ef of Aeromedical S	Services (SGP) at	tend any of your (OG meetings?	
Frequently					
Occasionally					
Never					
90. Does your Chi	ef of Aeromedical	Services attend W	ing Standup?		
Frequently					
Occasionally					
Never					
•	our Chief of Aerome ational factors that of Excellent			advises wing lead	ership regarding No Opinion
	e performance of y pons system in you Excellent				· ·
	e performance of y ding aeromedical p ce enhancement.				
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
-	our Chief of Aerome nental and operation		-	_	
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion

Page 82 22

95. Please rate your Chief of Aeromedical Services' depth and breadth of kno	wledge in the foll	lowing areas:
--	--------------------	---------------

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	
Operational Issues							
Flight Safety Issues							
Occupational Health							
Medicine and Medical Practice							
96. How well prepa installation?	red is your Chief of Ae	eromedical Service	s to lead the	other flight s	urgeons a	it your	
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor		No Opinion	
2016 State of the	e Flight Surgeon						
Squadron Comm	ander						
_	(had) you been a squa	adron commander	?				
Less than 6 month	Less than 6 months						
6- 12 Months							
13-18 Months							
19- 24 Months							
Greater than 24 M	onths						

Page 83 23

2016 State of the Fi	light Surgeon				
99. For which wea	pon system is (wa	s) your squadron r	esponsible?		
Airborne Comma	nd and Control				
Attack/ Fighter					
Bomber					
Cargo					
High Performance	e Trainer				
Heavy Trainer					
Reconnaissance					
Helicopter					
Missile and/or La	unch Ops				
RPA					
Other					
100. My squadron	has:				
A squadron medic	cal element (SME) fligh	t surgeon			
One (1) attached	flight surgeon				
Multiple attached	flight surgeons				
No SME or attach	ned flight surgeon				
2016 State of th	ne Flight Surged	on			
SME Flight Surg	jeons				
This group of que	estions concerns	specifically your	own SME flight	surgeon.	
101. Do you consi safety, human fact	der your SME fligh ors and human pe		-	nedical advisor re્	garding flying
Yes					
No					
102. Please rate the	he performance of	your SME flight su	urgeon in this capa	acity.	
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
		()		()	

Page 84 24

No

103. Please rate the other SME person	•	your SME flight s	urgeon in providin	g and arranging n	nedical training for
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
104. Does your SM Frequently Occasionally Never	1E flight surgeon a	attend your Comm	ander's Calls?		
105. Does your SM Frequently Occasionally Never 106. Does your SM Commander's Calls Yes No	1E flight surgeon p	oresent aeromedic	al, flight safety or		oics at
Unsure					
107. Please rate you environmental and Superior	= '	-			= =
108. Please rate th SME.	e performance of	your SME flight s	urgeon in supervis	ing the other mer	nbers of your
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
		0			
109. Does your SM	1E flight surgeon fl	y regularly and fre	equently with your	squadron?	

Page 85 25

110. Is your SME flight	surgeon invo	lved in squadro	n social functi	ons?		
Frequently						
Occasionally						
Never						
111. Please rate your S	SME's flight su	ırgeon's depth a	and breadth of	f knowledge in	the following	areas:
	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
Operational Issues						
Flight Safety Issues						
Occupational Health						
Medicine and Medical Practice						
112. While you have be unit?	een, or were, a	a squadron con	nmander, did y	our SME fligh	t surgeon dep	loy with your
Yes						
No						
N/A, my unit did not de	ploy					

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

Page 86 26

113. Please rate your SME flight surgeon's performance during deployment in the flowing areas:

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No opinion
Arranging and ensuring adequate medical support of the squadron						
Utilizing medical intelligence resources to keep squadron personnel aware of medical threats	\bigcirc			0		
Ensuring proper deployment sanitation including billeting, food, and water assessment						
Readiness for mishaps and disasters (response plans, checklists, and equipment)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\circ		
2016 State of the Fl	ight Surge	on				
2016 State of the Fl			urgeon to lead	l your Squadro	on Medical El	
114. Overall, how well			surgeon to lead	l your Squadro Fair	on Medical Ele Poor	ement? No opinion
	prepared is yo	our SME flight s	_			
114. Overall, how well In garrison In deployed location	prepared is you	our SME flight s	Good	Fair		
114. Overall, how well In garrison	prepared is you	our SME flight s	Good	Fair		
114. Overall, how well In garrison In deployed location	prepared is your superior	our SME flight s Excellent O ents positive, ne	Good	Fair		

This group of questions concerns specifically the flight surgeon(s) attached to your squadron.

Page 87 27

•	nsider your attached f actors and human per	•	•	eromedical adviso	or regarding flying
Yes					
No					
117. Please rat	e the performance of y	our attached fligh	nt surgeon in this o	capacity.	
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
118 Does your	attached flight surged	n attend vour Co	mmander's Calls?		
Frequently	attaonoa mgm oargoe	in allona your oo	initialitati o Gallo.		
Occasionally					
Never					
Nevel					
119. Does your	attached flight surged	n attend your Flig	ght Safety meeting	ıs/briefings?	
Frequently					
Occasionally					
Never					
120. Does vour	attached flight surged	on present aerom	edical. flight safety	or general safety	v topics at
-	Calls and/or Flight Saf	-		3	,
Frequently					
Occasionally					
Never					
	e your attached flight and operation	_	•	•	
Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion

Page 88 28

2016 State of the Flight S	urgeon					
122. Does your attached flight surgeon fly regularly and frequently with your squadron?						
Yes						
No						
No, the attached flight s	surgeon is not on	flying status				
N/A						
123. Is your attached fl Frequently Occasionally Never 124. Please rate your a					in the followir	ng areas:
	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
Operational Issues						
Flight Safety Issues						
Occupational Health						
Medicine and Medical Practice			\bigcirc			
125. Do you have any further comments, positive, negative, or otherwise? 2016 State of the Flight Surgeon						
Survey Complete						

Thank you for your time and effort with this survey.

The results will be analyzed and published in a 2016 issue of Flight Lines. Additionally, the conclusions of this study will be presented at the 87th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Aerospace Medical Association to the Society of United States Air Force Flight Surgeons.

Page 89 29

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

Page 90 30

Appendix C: XLSTAT

Question Num 104/118 Rank	(101/116	Rank							
RespondentID Does your flight	t surg	RespondentIE Rate your	flight surg	eon as your personal aerome	dical advisor regarding flying	safety, hu	man factors and human p	performar	nce enhancement?	
4646539021 Frequently	1	4646539021 Excellent	2	4642564666 Occasional	2 4642564666 Good	3	4617269363 Never	3	4617269363 Fair	4
4642358738 Frequently	1	4642358738 Superior	1	4635599835 Occasional	2 4635599835 Superior	1	. 4650688922 Never	3	4650688922 Good	3
4637305584 Frequently	1	4637305584 Superior	1	4608563348 Occasional	2 4608563348 Superior	1	. 4636901274 Never	3	4636901274 Excellent	2
4636043743 Frequently	1	4636043743 Superior	1	4654442843 Occasional	2 4654442843 Excellent	2	4605291487 Never	3	4605291487 Fair	4
4635941940 Frequently	1	4635941940 Superior	1	4640920806 Occasional	2 4640920806 Superior	1	. 4604772547 Never	3	4604772547 Good	3
4635609102 Frequently	1	4635609102 Excellent	2	4636740093 Occasional	2 4636740093 Superior	1				
4620085209 Frequently	1	4620085209 Excellent	2	4612975071 Occasional	2 4612975071 Excellent	2	<mark>?</mark>			
4615856306 Frequently	1	4615856306 Excellent	2	4604921714 Occasional	2 4604921714 Superior	1				
4615844714 Frequently	1	4615844714 Excellent	2	4602548377 Occasional	2 4602548377 Excellent	2	<mark>?</mark>			
4561585889 Frequently	1	4561585889 Superior	1	4600894818 Occasional	2 4600894818 Good	3	<mark>}</mark>			
4642938284 Frequently	1	4642938284 Excellent	2	4582097709 Occasional	2 4582097709 Superior	1				
4641153912 Frequently	1	4641153912 Good	3							
4636635104 Frequently	1	4636635104 Superior	1							
4636101937 Frequently	1	4636101937 Good	3							
4635870816 Frequently	1	4635870816 Superior	1							
4635344930 Frequently	1	4635344930 Excellent	2							
4627924329 Frequently	1	4627924329 Superior	1							
4610907628 Frequently	1	4610907628 Excellent	2							
4591914219 Frequently	1	4591914219 Superior	1							
4565515167 Frequently	1	4565515167 Superior	1							
4562348921 Frequently	1	4562348921 Excellent	2							

Commander's Perception of Advice Quality From Flight Surgeon Compared by Frequency of Flying Squadron Commander's Call Attendance (Frequently vs. Occa

Significance level (%): 5 p-value: Asymptotic p-value

Summary statistics:

Variable	Observations	Obs. with missing data	Obs. without missing data	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Frequently	21	0	21	1.000	3.000	1.619	0.669
Occasionally	21	10	11	1.000	3.000	1.636	0.809
Never	21	16	5	2.000	4.000	3.200	0.837

Kruskal-Wallis test:

K (Observed value)	9.862
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.007
alpha	0.05

An approximation has been used to compute the p-value.

Test interpretation:

H0: Flight surgeon Commander's Call attendance is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon. Ha: Flight surgeon Commander's Call attendance is associated with a difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon.

As the computed p-value is lower than the significance level alpha=0.05, one should reject the null hypothesis H0.

The risk to reject the null hypothesis H0 while it is true is lower than 0.72%.

Ties have been detected in the data and the appropriate corrections have been applied.

Multiple pairwise comparisons using Dunn's procedure / Two-tailed test:

Sample	Frequency	Sum of ranks	Mean of ranks	Gro	ups
Frequently	21	357.000	17.000	Α	
Occasionally	11	185.000	16.818	Α	
Never	5	161.000	32.200		В

Table of pairwise differences:

Question Nu 105/119 Rank	Question Nur 102/117	Rank						
Respondentl Does your flight su	rg RespondentII Rate your	Please rate the performance of your S	SME flig	ht surgeon in this capac	ity.			
4646539021 Frequently	1 4646539021 Excellent	2 4642564666 Occasional	2	4642564666 Good	3	4617269363 Never	3	4617269363 Fair
4642358738 Frequently	1 4642358738 Superior	1 4654442843 Occasional	2	4654442843 Excellent	2	4650688922 Never	3	4650688922 Good
4637305584 Frequently	1 4637305584 Superior	1 4640920806 Occasional	2	4640920806 Superior	1	4605291487 Never	3	4605291487 Fair
4636043743 Frequently	1 4636043743 Superior	1 4636635104 Occasional	2	4636635104 Superior	1	4604772547 Never	3	4604772547 Good
4635941940 Frequently	1 4635941940 Superior	1 4612975071 Occasional	2	4612975071 Excellent	2			
4635609102 Frequently	1 4635609102 Excellent	2 4610907628 Occasional	2	4610907628 Excellent	2			
4635599835 Frequently	1 4635599835 Superior	1 4604921714 Occasional	2	4604921714 Superior	1			
4620085209 Frequently	1 4620085209 Excellent	2 4602548377 Occasional	2	4602548377 Excellent	2			
4615856306 Frequently	1 4615856306 Excellent	2 4600894818 Occasional	2	4600894818 Good	3			
4615844714 Frequently	1 4615844714 Excellent	2 4582097709 Occasional	2	4582097709 Superior	1			
4608563348 Frequently	1 4608563348 Superior	1						
4561585889 Frequently	1 4561585889 Superior	1						
4642938284 Frequently	1 4642938284 Excellent	2						
4641153912 Frequently	1 4641153912 Good	3						
4636901274 Frequently	1 4636901274 Excellent	2						
4636740093 Frequently	1 4636740093 Superior	1						
4636101937 Frequently	1 4636101937 Good	3						
4635870816 Frequently	1 4635870816 Superior	1						
4635344930 Frequently	1 4635344930 Excellent	2						
4627924329 Frequently	1 4627924329 Superior	1						
4591914219 Frequently	1 4591914219 Superior	1						
4565515167 Frequently	1 4565515167 Superior	1						
4562348921 Frequently	1 4562348921 Excellent	2						

Commander's Perception of Advice Quality From Flight Surgeon Compared by Frequency of Flight Saftety Meeting Participation (Frequent vs. Occasional vs. Ne

Significance level (%): 5 p-value: Asymptotic p-value

Summary statistics:

Variable	Observations	Obs. with missing data	Obs. without missing data	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Frquently	23	0	23	1.000	3.000	1.565	0.662
Ocassionally	23	13	10	1.000	3.000	1.800	0.789
Never	23	19	4	3.000	4.000	3.500	0.577

Kruskal-Wallis test:

K (Observed value)	11.096
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.004
alpha	0.05

An approximation has been used to compute the p-value.

Test interpretation:

H0: Flight Safety meeting participation is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon.

Ha: Flight Safety meeting participation is associated with difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon.

As the computed p-value is lower than the significance level alpha=0.05, one should reject the null hypothesis H0.

The risk to reject the null hypothesis H0 while it is true is lower than 0.39%.

Ties have been detected in the data and the appropriate corrections have been applied.

Multiple pairwise comparisons using Dunn's procedure / Two-tailed test:

Sample	Frequently	requently Sum of ranks Mean of ranks		Gro	ups
Frequently	23	374.000	16.261	Α	
Ocassionally	10	191.000	19.100	Α	
Never	4	138.000	34.500		В

Table of pairwise differences:

	Frequently	Ocassionally	Never
Frequently	0	-2.839	-18.239
Ocassionally	2.839	0	-15.400
Never	18.239	15.400	0

p-values:

	Frequently	Ocassionally	Never
Frequently	1	0.458	0.001
Ocassionally	0.458	1	0.010
Never	0.001	0.010	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.0167

Significant differences:

	Frequently	Ocassionally	Never
Frequently	No	No	Yes
Ocassionally	No	No	Yes
Never	Yes	Yes	No

ever)

Question Numb 107/121 Rank		Question Numl 102/117	Rank						
RespondentID Rate your Please	rat	RespondentID Rate your	Please rat	e the performance of your	SME flight surgeon in this capa	city.			
4642358738 Superior	1	4642358738 Superior	1	4646539021 Excellent	2 4646539021 Excellent	2	4641153912 Good	3 4641153912 Good	3
4637305584 Superior	1	4637305584 Superior	1	4642564666 Excellent	2 4642564666 Good	3	4636101937 Good	3 4636101937 Good	3
4636043743 Superior	1	4636043743 Superior	1	4635609102 Excellent	2 4635609102 Excellent	2	4602548377 Good	3 4602548377 Excellent	2
4635941940 Superior	1	4635941940 Superior	1	4635599835 Excellent	2 4635599835 Superior	1	4600894818 Good	3 4600894818 Good	3
4615856306 Superior	1	4640920806 Superior	1	4620085209 Excellent	2 4620085209 Excellent	2	<mark>2</mark>		
4608563348 Superior	1	4608563348 Superior	1	4615844714 Excellent	2 4615844714 Excellent	2	<mark>2</mark>		
4561585889 Superior	1	4561585889 Superior	1	4636901274 Excellent	2 4636901274 Excellent	2	<mark>2</mark>		
4635870816 Superior	1	4635870816 Superior	1	4635344930 Excellent	2 4635344930 Excellent	2	2		
4627924329 Superior	1	4627924329 Superior	1	4565515167 Excellent	2 4565515167 Superior	1			
4591914219 Superior	1	4591914219 Superior	1	4654442843 Excellent	2 4654442843 Excellent	2	<mark>2</mark>		
4636740093 Superior	1	4636740093 Superior	1	4642938284 Excellent	2 4642938284 Excellent	2	<mark>2</mark>		
4636635104 Superior	1	4636635104 Superior	1	4604921714 Excellent	2 4604921714 Superior	1			
4610907628 Superior	1	4610907628 Excellent	2	4562348921 Excellent	2 4562348921 Excellent	2	<u>?</u>		

Commander's Perception of Advice Quality From Flight Surgeon Compared by Quality of Briefing Presentation (Superior vs. Excellent vs. Good)

Significance level (%): 5 p-value: Asymptotic p-value

Summary statistics:

Variable	Observationwith	missinįtho	ut missi	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	td. deviation
Superior	13	0	13	1.000	2.000	1.077	0.277
Excellent	13	0	13	1.000	3.000	1.846	0.555
Good	13	9	4	2.000	3.000	2.750	0.500

Kruskal-Wallis test:

K (Observed value)	18.275
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.000
alpha	0.05

An approximation has been used to compute the p-value.

Test interpretation:

H0: Quality of breifing presentation is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon

Ha: Quality of breifing presentation is associated with a difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon

As the computed p-value is lower than the significance level alpha=0.05, one should reject the null hypothesis H0.

The risk to reject the null hypothesis H0 while it is true is lower than 0.01%.

Ties have been detected in the data and the appropriate corrections have been applied.

Multiple pairwise comparisons using Dunn's procedure / Two-tailed test:

Sample	Frequenc	y ium of rank	Gro	ups	
Superior	13	117.000	9.000	Α	
Excellent	13	241.500	18.577		В

Good 4 106.500 26.625 B

Table of pairwise differences:

	Superior	Excellent	Good
Superior	0	-9.577	-17.625
Excellent	9.577	0	-8.048
Good	17.625	8.048	0

p-values:

	Superior	Excellent	Good
Superior	1	0.002	0.000
Excellent	0.002	1	0.078
Good	0.000	0.078	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.0167

Significant differences:

	Superior	Excellent	Good
Superior	No	Yes	Yes
Excellent	Yes	No	No
Good	Yes	No	No

Question Nun 109/122	Rank	Question Numb	102/117	Rank				
RespondentID Does your	flight surg	RespondentID	Rate your	Please rate	the performance of	your SME fligh	t surgeon in this capacit	у.
4646539021 Yes	1	4646539021 I	Excellent	2	4617269363 No	2	4617269363 Fair	4
4642564666 Yes	1	4642564666	Good	3	4615844714 No	2	4615844714 Excellent	2
4642358738 Yes	1	4642358738	Superior	1	4608563348 No	2	4608563348 Superior	1
4637305584 Yes	1	4637305584	Superior	1	4654442843 No	2	4654442843 Excellent	2
4635941940 Yes	1	4635941940	Superior	1	4650688922 No	2	4650688922 Good	3
4635609102 Yes	1	4635609102 I	Excellent	2	4640920806 No	2	4640920806 Superior	1
4635599835 Yes	1	4635599835	Superior	1	4636901274 No	2	4636901274 Excellent	2
4620085209 Yes	1	4620085209 I	Excellent	2	4636740093 No	2	4636740093 Superior	1
4615856306 Yes	1	4615856306 I	Excellent	2	4605291487 No	2	4605291487 Fair	4
4561585889 Yes	1	4561585889	Superior	1	4562348921 No	2	4562348921 Excellent	2
4642938284 Yes	1	4642938284	Excellent	2				
4641153912 Yes	1	4641153912	Good	3				
4636635104 Yes	1	4636635104	Superior	1				
4635870816 Yes	1	4635870816	Superior	1				
4635344930 Yes	1	4635344930 I	Excellent	2				
4627924329 Yes	1	4627924329	Superior	1				
4612975071 Yes	1	4612975071 I	Excellent	2				
4610907628 Yes	1	4610907628 I	Excellent	2				
4604921714 Yes	1	4604921714	Superior	1				
4604772547 Yes	1	4604772547	Good	3				
4602548377 Yes	1	4602548377	Excellent	2				
4600894818 Yes	1	4600894818	Good	3				
4591914219 Yes	1	4591914219	Superior	1				
4565515167 Yes	1	4565515167	Superior	1				
4636043743 No	2	4636043743	Superior	1				

Commander's Perception of Advice Quality From Flight Surgeon Compared by Performance of Regular Flight Operations.

Significance level (%): 5 p-value: Asymptotic p-value

Summary statistics:

Variable	Observations	Obs. with missing data	Obs. without missing data	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Regular Flight	25	0	25	1.000	3.000	1.680	0.748
No Regular Flight	25	15	10	1.000	4.000	2.200	1.135

Kruskal-Wallis test:

K (Observed value)	1.574
K (Critical value)	3.841
DF	1
p-value (Two-tailed	0.210
alpha	0.05

An approximation has been used to compute the p-value.

Test interpretation:

HO: Regular flying is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon.

Ha: Regular flying is associated with a difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon.

As the computed p-value is greater than the significance level alpha=0.05, one cannot reject the null hypothesis H0.

The risk to reject the null hypothesis H0 while it is true is 20.97%.

Ties have been detected in the data and the appropriate corrections have been applied.

Multiple pairwise comparisons using Dunn's procedure / Two-tailed test:

Sample	Frequency	Sum of ranks	Mean of ranks	Groups
Regular Flight	25	418.000	16.720	Α
No Regular Flight	10	212.000	21.200	Α

Table of pairwise differences:

	Regular Flight	No Regular Flight
Regular Flight	0	-4.480
No Regular Flight	4.480	0

p-values:

	Regular Flight	No Regular Flight
Var1	1	0.210
Var2	0.210	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.05

Significant differences:

	Regular Flight	No Regular Flight
Regular Flight	No	No
No Regular Flight	No	No

Question Number	110/123	Rank	Question Number	102/117	Rank							
RespondentID	Is your fli	ght surgeor	RespondentID	Rate your	flight surge	eon as your personal aeromed	ical advi	sor regarding flying safet	y, human i	actors and human performance en	hancement?	
4646539021	Frequently	y 1	4646539021	Excellent	2	4642564666 Occasionally	2	4642564666 Good	3	4617269363 Never 3	4617269363 Fair	4
4642358738	Frequently	y 1	4642358738	Superior	1	4637305584 Occasionally	2	4637305584 Superior	1	4654442843 Never 3	4654442843 Excellent	2
4636043743	Frequently	y 1	4636043743	Superior Superior	1	4615844714 Occasionally	2	4615844714 Excellent	2	4650688922 Never 3	4650688922 Good	3
4635941940	Frequently	y 1	4635941940	Superior	1	4641153912 Occasionally	2	4641153912 Good	3	4636901274 Never 3	4636901274 Excellent	2
4635609102	Frequently	y 1	4635609102	2 Excellent	2	4640920806 Occasionally	2	4640920806 Superior	1	4605291487 Never 3	4605291487 Fair	4
4635599835	Frequently	y 1	4635599835	Superior	1	4636740093 Occasionally	2	4636740093 Superior	1	4604772547 Never 3	4604772547 Good	3
4620085209	Frequently	y 1	4620085209	Excellent	2	4636635104 Occasionally	2	4636635104 Superior	1		-	
4615856306	Frequently	y 1	4615856306	Excellent	2	4636101937 Occasionally	2	4636101937 Good	3			
4608563348	Frequently	y 1	4608563348	Superior	1	4635870816 Occasionally	2	4635870816 Superior	1			
4561585889	Frequently	y 1	4561585889	Superior	1	4612975071 Occasionally	2	4612975071 Excellent	2			
4642938284	Frequently	y 1	4642938284	Excellent	2	4602548377 Occasionally	2	4602548377 Excellent	2			
4635344930	Frequently	y 1	4635344930	Excellent (2	4600894818 Occasionally	2	4600894818 Good	3			
4627924329	Frequently	y 1	4627924329	Superior	1	4562348921 Occasionally	2	4562348921 Excellent	2			
4610907628	Frequently	y 1	4610907628	8 Excellent	2							
4604921714	Frequently	y 1	4604921714	Superior	1							
4591914219	Frequently	y 1	4591914219	Superior	1							
4565515167	Frequently	y 1	4565515167	⁷ Superior	1							

Commander's Perception of Advice Quality From Flight Surgeon Compared by Frequency of Social Event Participation (Frequent vs. Occasional vs. Never)

Significance level (%): 5 p-value: Asymptotic p-value

Summary statistics:

Variable	Observations	Obs. with missing data	Obs. without missing data	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Frequent	17	0	17	1.000	2.000	1.412	0.507
Occasional	17	4	13	1.000	3.000	1.923	0.862
Never	17	11	6	2.000	4.000	3.000	0.894

Kruskal-Wallis test:

K (Observed value)	11.753
K (Critical value)	5.991
DF	2
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.003
alpha	0.05

An approximation has been used to compute the p-value.

Test interpretation:

H0: Social event participation is associated with no difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon.

Ha: Social event participation is associated with difference of commander's perception of quality of advice of flight surgeon.

As the computed p-value is lower than the significance level alpha=0.05, one should reject the null hypothesis H0.

The risk to reject the null hypothesis H0 while it is true is lower than 0.28%.

Ties have been detected in the data and the appropriate corrections have been applied.

Multiple pairwise comparisons using Dunn's procedure / Two-tailed test:

Sample	Frequency	Sum of ranks Mean of ranks		Gro	oups
Frequent	17	234.000	13.765	Α	
Occasional	13	254.000	19.538	Α	В
Never	6	178.000	29.667		В

Table of pairwise differences:

	Frequent	Occasional	Neve	r
Frequent		0	-5.774	-15.902
Occasional	5.77	5.774		-10.128
Never	15.90	15.902		0

p-values:

	Frequent	Occasional	Never	
Frequent		1	0.112	0.001
Occasional	0.13	12	1	0.037
Never	0.00	01	0.037	1

Bonferroni corrected significance level: 0.0167

Significant differences:

	Frequent	Occasional	Never	
Frequent	No	No	Yes	
Occasional	No	No	No	
Never	Yes	No	No	

Question Number	110/123		Question Number	102/117	Rank					
RespondentID	Is your fli	ght surgeon	RespondentID	Rate your	flight surge	on as your p	ersonal aeron	nedical advisor rega	rding flying safety, hun	nan factors and
					Participati	on			_	None
4646539021	Frequently	, 1	4646539021	Excellent	2		4617269363	Never	3 4617269363 Fair	4
4642358738	Frequently	, 1	4642358738	Superior	1		4654442843	Never	3 4654442843 Excellen	t 2
4636043743	Frequently	, 1	4636043743	Superior	1		4650688922	Never	3 4650688922 Good	3
4635941940	Frequently	, 1	4635941940	Superior	1		4636901274	Never	3 4636901274 Excellen	t <mark>2</mark>
4635609102	Frequently	, 1	4635609102	Excellent	2		4605291487	Never	3 4605291487 Fair	4
4635599835	Frequently	, 1	4635599835	Superior	1		4604772547	Never	3 4604772547 Good	3
4620085209	Frequently	, 1	4620085209	Excellent	2					
4615856306	Frequently	, 1	4615856306	Excellent	2					
4608563348	Frequently	, 1	4608563348	Superior	1					
4561585889	Frequently	, 1	4561585889	Superior	1					
4642938284	Frequently	, 1	4642938284	Excellent	2					
4635344930	Frequently	, 1	4635344930	Excellent	2					
4627924329	Frequently	, 1	4627924329	Superior	1					
4610907628	Frequently	, 1	4610907628	Excellent	2					
4604921714	Frequently	, 1	4604921714	Superior	1					
4591914219	Frequently	, 1	4591914219	Superior	1					
4565515167	Frequently	, 1	4565515167	Superior	1					
4642564666	Occasiona	II 2	4642564666	Good	3					
4637305584	Occasiona	II 2	4637305584	Superior	1					
4615844714	Occasiona	II 2	4615844714	Excellent	2					
4641153912	Occasiona	II 2	4641153912	Good	3					
4640920806	Occasiona	II 2	4640920806	Superior	1					
4636740093	Occasiona	II 2	4636740093	Superior	1					
4636635104	Occasiona	II 2	4636635104	Superior	1					
4636101937	Occasiona	II 2	4636101937	Good	3					
4635870816	Occasiona	II 2	4635870816	Superior	1					
4612975071	Occasiona	II 2	4612975071	Excellent	2					
4602548377	Occasiona	II 2	4602548377	Excellent	2					
4600894818	Occasiona	II 2	4600894818	Good	3					
4562348921	Occasiona	II 2	4562348921	Excellent	2					

2016 State of the Flight Surgeon

d human performance enhancement?

Commander's Perception of Advice Quality From Flight Surgeon Stratified by Social Event Participation (Yes vs. No)

Hypothesized difference (D): 0 Significance level (%): 5 p-value: Asymptotic p-value

Summary statistics:

Variable	Observations	Obs. with missing data	Obs. without missing data	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Participation	30	0	30	1.000	3.000	1.633	0.718
None	6	0	6	2.000	4.000	3.000	0.894

Mann-Whitney test / Two-tailed test:

U	23.000
Expected value	90.000
Variance (U)	486.429
p-value (Two-tailed)	0.003
alpha	0.05

An approximation has been used to compute the p-value.

Test interpretation:

H0: There is no difference in commander perception of advice quiality when stratified for social participation.

Ha: There is a difference in commander perception of advice quiality when stratified for social participation.

As the computed p-value is lower than the significance level alpha=0.05, one should reject the null hypothesis H0.

The risk to reject the null hypothesis H0 while it is true is lower than 0.26%.

The continuity correction has been applied.

Ties have been detected in the data and the appropriate corrections have been applied.

Appendix D: Transcript of SNIPEr's Address, 2016 SoUSAFFS Luncheon

The godfathers of our profession such as Theodore Lyster, Malcom Grow, and even Hadley Reed knew the importance of the practice environment being outside the four clinic walls...not only to be reactionary to ailments, but to observe our patients in their occupation to: prevent harms, optimize performance with ultimate goal to provide the Line maximal resources with which to execute our national defense policy...demonstrating global reach and when necessary killing people and breaking their stuff.

Flight Surgeons...we support the Line. As the Iguana says, "we are special".

Healthcare in the military, all but with a few exceptions can be contracted out to the lowest bidder. I maintain that there is no better place to examine the inextricable linkage between human sustainment and mission completion the Flight Medicine Clinic...read Operational Medicine.

Throughout our organizational history we have enjoyed a collective position of trust from the Line. This trust, built on credibility cannot be taken for granted. Once tarnished, it can rarely be restored.

The purpose of the State of the Flight Surgeon Survey as commissioned by the Surgeon General more than a decade ago is two-fold.

First: to look into the mirror to assess the condition of our morale, to define deficiencies that impede our duties, and to provide a generalized futurestate of the Flight Surgeon.

Second: to focus outwardly to the Line (our reason for existence) and get feedback to bolster or correct any trends.

In addition to the handouts provided, I will present some selected highlights from the 2016 survey. A final report with statistical analysis will be announced in a future issue of Flight Lines.

---SURVEY DATA PRESENTATION---

So what does this mean? The Line may not always understand what we do, but they do understand that we are a value-added resource. The overwhelming theme from the Line this year is that they need and want our presence. You might not always feel needed, but you would be missed.

Clinical knowledge and professional demeanor are the currency by which credibility is purchased. This credibility is ESSENTIAL in dealings with the Line and the AFMS alike. Flight Surgeons, we are indeed special, but remember that we are physicians foremost. Help bring the greater AFMS to collectively know that we are practitioners of Aerospace and Operational MEDICINE. Do not perpetuate the elitist perception that has poisoned so many of our interactions with other Medical Group entities.

Young Flight Surgeons, I have two words that will lead to your success with the Line...Be there. Be there in clinic for their healthcare needs; be there on the flight line generating credibility as aircrew, no self-loading cargo; be there in the meeting ready to confidently answer "hey doc, what do you think?' be there in the bar sharing the collective aviation heritage; be there on the weekend when your flyer's child has fever and is inconsolable; be there with compassion when sharing a new cancer diagnosis with their spouse.....just Be There.