



Instructor and Coach **NEWSLETTER**

Welcome to the second edition of the Instructor and Coach Newsletter - and before we go any further we apologise for the non-appearance of the issue planned for last autumn. However, you have our assurance that this will be bi-annual - you'll receive a copy each spring and autumn.

For simplicity, cost (and the time being) we intend to keep the same A5 format in black and white.

As well as reflecting FSC areas of interest, the newsletter is a means of passing on information between the FSC and instructors/coaches, AND between yourselves, enabling us all to keep abreast of current trends in teaching/coaching and changes in the regulations and the various interpretations and clarifications.

So - if the newsletter is to be of value it must be a two way thing. We need feedback both positive and negative on all areas of the coaching and instructional set up. All relevant comments will be brought to the attention of the FSC giving coaches and instructors the opportunity to influence policies and future developments and training techniques in our sport.

All contributions/suggestions/articles/letters are welcome, please send them to the Newsletter compiler :

email: dave-thompson@bhpa.co.uk

fax: 01792 280941

mail: Dave Thompson, 13a Sketty Avenue, Swansea, SA2 0TE

FROM THE AIRSPACE PANEL

Filing an Airprox

Over the last five years or so the BHPA has seen a significant increase in its flying membership. This has led to an understandable proportional increase in the number of Airprox reports that are being filed by our members. With this in mind it is important that our members (particularly our Instructors and Coaches whom this publication is aimed at, and from whom advice is sought by other members) are aware of the correct procedure for filing such reports. If the correct procedure is not followed then significant delays can occur in the commencement of appropriate tracing and other actions that may be required to attain a satisfactory conclusion.

First let me remind you of the Definition of an AIRPROX - " A situation in which, in the opinion of the pilot or controller, the distance between aircraft as well as their relative positions and speed have been such that the safety of the aircraft involved was or may have been compromised."

Any BHPA member who wishes to file an Airprox should ideally follow the procedure below:

1. Inform either Les Smallwood or Tom Hardie (both are members of the FSC Airspace Panel and their phone/fax numbers are always in Skywings) Should this not be possible do not delay the next step, that is the initial telephone

report.

2. Initial Report - this will normally be made by telephone to the London or Scottish Air Traffic Control centres, as appropriate. You can use the free phone number that you use for site notification if you wish.

3. Confirmation Report - the initial report must be confirmed within seven days in writing on the Airprox Pilots Form (report form CA 1094), direct to the Joint Airmisss Section at the address shown on the form. Forms are available from the BHPA office on request. It is stressed that the written form is for confirmation only and must not be used as the initial report - it is not quick enough.

4. Also file a BHPA Incident Report Form.

BHPA representatives have input into the Joint

Airmisss Section (JAS) and the Joint Airmisss Working Group (JAWG), the two bodies tasked with investigating, and if necessary making recommendations on, close encounters between aircraft. These bodies retain their existing titles despite Airprox now being the correct term. The results from airprox reports filed by BHPA members should soon be published in Skywings so that all our members can see how these reports are processed and investigated together with any recommendations that may be appropriate.

If you have any questions regarding Airprox Reports or any other Airspace related matter please do not hesitate to contact Les Smallwood or Tom Hardie or any of the BHPA Technical Staff.

Is your map up to date ???

All pilots who fly cross country should be flying with the current editions of aeronautical charts, either 1:500 000 scale or 1:250 000 scale, whichever they consider most appropriate for their intended flight. If you fly cross country with an

out of date chart then you are risking not being aware of airspace and other feature alterations that may affect your track. This could of course lead in turn to prosecution for various offences.

The current chart indexes are as follows:

Aeronautical Charts ICAO Scale 1:500 000 - United Kingdom

Sheet No. & Title	Edition Number	Validity Date
2150ABCD Scotland, Orkney & Shetland	18	1 March 1997
2171AB N. England & N. Ireland	19	1 Aug 1996
2171CD S. England & Wales	23	1 March 1997

Under normal conditions the revision cycle is 1 to 2 years.

Topographical Air Charts Of The United Kingdom - Scale 1:250 000

Sheet N. & Title	Edition Number	Validity Date
1 Orkney & Shetland	11	6 Feb 1992
2 NW. Scotland	10	23 Jun 1994
3 N. Scotland	12	6 Jun 1996
4 W. Highlands	11	21 Jul 1994
5 E. Highlands	13	18 Aug 1994
6 Firth of Clyde	14	12 Oct 1995
7 Firth of Forth	14	7 Dec 1995
8 Solway Firth	14	6 Jun 1996
9 NE. England	15	29 Aug 1996
10 N. Wales & Merseyside	14	1 Feb 1996
11 N. Midlands & Yorkshire	15	26 Sept 1996
12 S. Wales	14	30 Mar 1995
13 The Midlands	16	1 May 1996
14 E. Anglia	15	11 Apr 1996

15	SW. England	14	1 Jun 1996
16	S. England	16	1 March 1997
17	SE. England	17	4 Jan 1996
18	N. Ireland	13	22 Jun 1995

Under normal conditions the revision cycle is 2 to 3 years.

All the above charts are available from:

Civil Aviation Authority; Aeronautical Charts Section (AP7)

Chart Room T1120

CAA House

45 - 49 Kingsway

London WC2B 6TE

Tel: 0171 - 832 5568/9

Fax: 0171 - 832 5525

or from any accredited chart agent.

Note: Information correct at time of going to press.

A MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRMAN, FSC

Reserve parachute packing errors

Many of you will remember a Safety Notice I posted last year following the only fatal accident in 1996 in the UK. A mid-air collision was followed by an unsuccessful parachute deployment due to it having been packed THROUGH the deployment bag, which held the mouth of the 'chute closed.

This incident has raised awareness in the UK, and a gratifying number of Clubs have been holding repacking evenings this winter.

The concerning fact is the number of serious packing and deployment errors that this has brought to light. For example at a recent evening, of 18 pilots, 8 had systems with either fatal or very serious errors. The errors have included a bridle rope that was almost worn through. A chute that had clearly been repacked by stuffing it back into its deployment cover after it fell out in the Alps last year. A paraglider pilot who had routed his bridle in such a way as to guarantee his strangulation in the event of a real deployment. A totally unsuitable type of chute nearly twenty years old (10 is suggested as a reasonable upper limit in jump chute reserves). Finally a pilot who had manufactured

his own home made bag to attach his chute to his harness was fortunate to discover in a classroom that the handle came off in his hand before the bag could be opened.

There is one other problem that has occurred at least three times in the UK (and whilst in light of the previous paragraph I would have a hard job defending the common sense of some of our pilots) I suspect that it will be happening elsewhere too. A Pilot buys a new harness and installs their parachute in the pouch already fitted for the purpose to their new harness. So far, so good, you think... But the new harness comes with a split pin to hold the pouch closed in transit... and our pilots, after installing the chutes, and using the correct deployment pins, then superfluously replace the split pin as well...

...and worse, either re-open the tines of the pin, or push it completely through the closure loop.. making it IMPOSSIBLE to deploy the parachute.

Please look out for any of these errors (or any number of new ones) both on your own equipment and that of other pilots.

A reserve will be the most useless purchase you are ever likely to make if it won't open when you need it...

Angus Pinkerton.

SPECIAL NOTICE

Would all Club Coaches and Instructors who run reserve parachute packing sessions please report ALL errors immediately to the BHPA.

AIRWORTHINESS? PANEL? COORDINATOR: DAVE? SOLLOM

What s all this certification anyway?

Years ago, when life was simple and paragliders didn't cost very much, there was this seemingly foolproof certification system, which graded paragliders A, B or C for various flight manoeuvres. Should a paraglider manage to get 12As then you (as an instructor) could happily stick any of your newly qualified punters on it and they wouldn't kill themselves. Unfortunately, as we all know, this system didn't even begin to work, but, even more unfortunately, the punters didn't know it didn't work, so merrily went ahead and attempted to purchase anything with 12As, (or even the odd B).

Something had to be done

The old 12As system did have other problems, the most oft quoted being the fact that it tested recovery, not stability, which needed addressing. So it was decided to have a total re-think.

Also happening at the same time was paragliders inclusion into the European system of standards. Effectively this meant that a paraglider would end up with a BS number (though now called a CE number to reflect the European aspect), under the general department of "Sports, Playground and other Recreational Equipment". To be able to get a CE number it is necessary for a piece of equipment to undergo certain tests, and these tests have to be written by, and approved by, a committee appointed by the Standards Authority.

Everything you have ever heard about how fast, efficiently and constructively a committee works is true. This was going to take (is still taking!) longer than rigging a 177 Full Race Magic 4 (ask your dad).

Two things happened. Firstly, because the new tests were attempting to fix the problems perceived with their predecessors it was thought to be a good idea to try them out in action. Therefore it was decided to adapt the AFNOR (acpul) tests to the new standard on a trail basis. Secondly, the Germans (and therefore the Austrians as well), took exception to their paragliders being called Sports Equipment (they regard them as proper aeroplanes), and they claimed that their airworthiness tests, which are

enshrined in civil law, were better. They had no intention of accepting the new tests.

These new tests

There are two major differences between the old 12As type tests and the new ones. One is an attempt to test for the ease, or otherwise, that a canopy will depart from it's stable flight envelope, rather than just the ease with which it will return to it, and the other was to get away from the "buyer's guide" aspect of the old tests, and try to get to a more general "certification" idea.

New tests for stability

Not an easy brief this; how do you find out how a canopy will react in rough old air when you can't arrange the same 'rough old air' for each canopy that you test. Five tests have been devised to give some idea, hopefully, of stability.

Speed range test (controls only)

Primarily designed to ensure that the glider has a sufficient speed range - but reducing the speed range is a trick performed by manufacturers when things start to get a little hairy at the top end. But a glider with no top speed is no fun for the punter.

Speed range test (no controls but with accessories (i.e. speed system/trimmers)

Again, it's a little disconcerting if the whole lot wraps itself up and disappears every time you heave on the speed bar. But equally there must be some point in having a speed bar.

Pitch stability

Go slow until you are just about to stall, then let the brakes off totally. A bit like leaving an active thermal. Tests to see if the glider will tuck when diving.

Manoeuvrability

Stuff the glider in a sharp turn, as though some idiot had just flown in front of you, and see what happens.

Turn reversal

Successive wing overs without too much grief.

Alongside these tests are twelve others that are looking for suitable recovery from various manoeuvres. These are similar to, but not the same as, the old tests that gave the 12 As.

Certification grading

Paragliders, alone in the aviation industry, used to have a testing regime that could tell you the experience level of the intended pilot. A jumbo jet, for instance, just gets a certificate; with it it's allowed to fly, without it, it stays on the ground. Even a hang glider is in much the same state - a certification requirement exists, and if it passes all the necessary tests then it gets a C of A. A Stubby (a right old boggy ship, but suitable for basic training) must pass the same test requirements as a Concept (a blade wing supreme). There is nothing written in the certification to say that a Concept or any other high performance wing shouldn't be flown by a total nonk, but they don't tend to be, because the instructors/suppliers/manufacturers all know better. (Basic rule; don't kill your punters if they still have ANY money).

Okay, so paragliders are a little different in the ease with which they will leap out of an acceptable flight envelope. So you test for all the different ways you can think of, of collapsing, spinning, spiralling, stalling and generally plummeting and, if it recovers without too much drama, you give it a certification. This certification we will call, for the sake of argument, STANDARD.

"Standard" was a word chosen after much discussion to reflect the notion that a glider suitable for the vast majority of recreational pilots would have this level of rating. It was not, and is not, meant to reflect the fact that a glider is or isn't suitable for beginners. If you are a recreational pilot, who would like to fly cross country but aren't too concerned if you fly 60km rather than 65km then you should be looking at flying a Standard Class paraglider.

So how do you tell if a glider is suitable for a beginner or not, I hear you ask. Well, just like you would with a hang glider - from your own experience, what the manufacturer says and what colour the glider is. It will be Standard Class, but not every Standard Class will be suitable for a beginner. And anyway, who's to say that a beginner glider in England is a beginner glider in the Alps?

There is, undoubtedly, some trade off between performance and stability, so, to run alongside the Standard rating, it was thought necessary to have a slightly slacker rating, for pilots who demanded a little more performance, and due to

their greater experience, were able to cope with less stability. This slacker rating we will call *performance*.

To get a Performance C of A, the glider must undergo all the same tests as Standard, but is allowed to, either, take a little longer, or, require more pilot input, to recover. You really shouldn't be looking at a performance glider unless you have heaps of flying hours and are finding that the performance (with a little 'p') of your standard class wing is holding you back. This is definitely your second glider - never your first.

Just to round things off, only really because someone had the vague notion that, sometime in the future competition organisers would insist on some sort of certification, a third class was made, comprising of a very limited set of basic requirements. To give you some idea of the philosophy behind this COMPETITION category, let me quote directly from the CEN document...
"Competition class: description...

The glider shall have some inherent stability, though this may be minimal. The glider shall also have some resistance to tucks and departures, though this can also be minimal. Recovery from departures from normal flight shall be possible, though this can require skilled, accurate pilot input and can take time. The handling can be demanding."

The performance would have to be the dog's bollox to put up with that sort of description.

There is also one special group of gliders that don't fit neatly into the above brackets, and that Tandem or Bi Place gliders. The requirements here are for a wing with excellent safety, but that is going to be, normally, flown by an experienced pilot. Therefore it needs good tuck resistance, but, were it to tuck, some pilot input is likely during the recovery. So these make up the fourth and final category, *two seater*.

That's the theory anyway.

So, back to the problems with the certification. These new tests have now been running with AFNOR for a year or two, and are generally pretty good - within the constraints above. The biggest complaint seems to be that you can't simply throw the punter straight onto the most expensive (or cheapest, for the northern schools) Standard Class wing about, because it might not be suitable for a beginner. Sorry, but you will have to use your own skill and judgment. Also,

you can no longer winge about the school down the road selling totally unsuitable gliders because the glider has 3Bs. You can winge about the school down the road selling totally unsuitable gliders because the gliders are totally unsuitable, but you can no longer use the certification standard as proof. If a manufacturer tells you that his new Standard Class wing is the best thing since sliced bread, and you think it's naff, then don't sell it - sell something that you think is good.

The Germans are still a bit of a problem, mostly because they have a different philosophy to doing the tests: they measure all the same things (approximately), but rely on the test pilot to also give considerable input. If the pilot didn't like the way a glider recovered, even if it did the necessary within specifications, then he would mark it down, and the glider would get a lower grade. Theoretically this is a damn good system, but is open to all sorts of practical problems, including having to have two test pilots, in case one is biased, putting up with lots of delays due to weather, and the whole system being very difficult to adapt to all the wide ranging conditions and philosophies across the whole of Europe.

Things are looking up though. Due to a few changes in the DHV, the German testing authority, and some nifty politicking some common

ground is appearing. Very soon we should have the tests finished in a way that is acceptable across the whole of Europe.

And finally

As with anything like this, some time is bound to elapse before things are running really smoothly. I still fly gliders that either have Competition certification or none at all, and really I should be happy with a Performance class wing. I won't sell a Performance wing to a beginner, but I probably would to someone with ten hours, which is theoretically much too early. But only some Performance wings, not any of them. There are some Standard wings out there which I wouldn't sell to a beginner, but the pilots with the experience to cope with them feel reluctant to buy them because all their mates have got Performance or Comp wings.

But things are changing

And eventually we will end up with a certification system that will be so widely accepted that you will hardly notice it at all.

Of course there is still paraglider structural strength tests, harness strength tests, reserve deployment, strength and sink rate tests, helmet tests, footwear tests, flying suit tests and have you noticed that your vario might already have a CE mark on the back. And your GPS, radio...

THE ? EXAMINATION ? AND ? INSPECTION ? PANEL

Preparation of Candidates for Instructor Examinations Prior to nominating a Trainee Instructor for an Instructor Examination CFIs, are required to ensure that, among other things, the Trainee Instructor has been signed off (in the TI's Instructors Logbook) as competent to brief in all training exercises up to Club Pilot level in the relevant disciplines; that is to say Exercises 1 to 13 inclusive for paragliding instructor candidates and Exercises 1 to 17 inclusive for hang gliding candidates. Also, that the TI has been given a comprehensive pre assessment mock examination, covering all areas of training, to ensure the candidate has attained the required standard.

These requirements are now included in the "CFI's Declaration" on the Application for Instructor Examination Proformas.

A survey of failed candidates indicates that, invariably, they have not been rigorously pretested. This is unfair to the candidate and a reflection on the school's CFI.

Recurring Weaknesses in Instructor Candidates

Feedback from examiners indicate two common faults, prevalent to all disciplines. The first is a lack of confirmation in factual lessons, to ensure that what has been taught has actually been learnt. In a skills lesson good candidates always confirm what has been taught by making the student repeat the skill till it has been performed correctly for a number of times in succession, it is considered that three or four times is the minimum. However often, candidates who are otherwise very good frequently fail to confirm that

the students have taken in the facts just taught. It is insufficient just to ask "any questions" at the end of a session. Pointed questions must be put, "What is this?", "Show me that", "Explain which...", "How would you.....", "Which has the right of way"etc.

The second common weakness we would like to be eliminated is in regard to demonstrations. It is expected that the initial demonstration should set the standard which the student is expected to attain and then repeated, this time with a full explanation. Unfortunately, all too often the candidates perform their initial demonstration in slow time, accompanied by an explanation and then have the student try to imitate what he has not seen performed complete and to perfection.

Senior Instructor Examinations

The functions that will be under scrutiny in Senior Instructor Examinations are:

1. Leadership
2. Decision Making
3. Organisational skills
4. Constructive supervision of Trainee

Instructors

5. BHPA administration
6. School Administration

The examination will generally take the form of a two day period running a School operation.

School Inspections

With the increase in our technical staff it has

School records. Why both ~~them?~~ points from *Dave Thompson*

Whilst on my travels last season it was pleasing to note the general improvement in the record keeping of the schools. Though there was generally room for improvement, most schools were keeping records at least of a minimum standard. There were however a few schools that, whilst keeping records, did not really appreciate their purpose, keeping them 'because they had to'!

Why do we have Records?

1. They are required under Health and Safety Regulations.
2. They allow the school to keep track of student progress and operational conditions.

been possible to extend the Inspection Programme. There are now two types of inspection:

1. Interim Inspections

With this type of inspection the Inspector (most frequently assistant Technical Officer, Dave Thompson) will arrive unannounced. It will be as a snapshot of the school and the Inspector will be there mainly in an advisory capacity. He will, however, look closely at the schools operations and possibly proffer advice or comment.

2. Formal Inspections

The formal inspection will remain very much as before. Notice will be given, operations, equipment, sites, TI training, school administration, teaching facilities, Student Progress Records and Daily Flight Records will all be scrutinised. An additional requirement is that the Inspector will need to see all recently completed written examination papers for Elementary and Club Pilots.

Following recent inspections the Inspectors have been able to report real improvements in the standards of Student Progress Records and Daily Flight Records. However, it is notable that when investigating insurance claims for injuries that occurred at schools, the investigator frequently finds inadequate records. The Technical Officer charged with the initial investigation into insurance claims is considering if there is a correlation between schools that generate insurance claims and those with poorly kept records.

3. They provide an invaluable record of procedure in the case of an insurance claim against the school.

An ability to track the prowess of student has obvious benefits. Keeping Student Records is the only way to ensure that the syllabus has been fully covered. It would be very easy to miss out an important stage, especially given that students rarely complete a course in successive days.

Student Records also allow other instructors within a school to become familiar with students they had not previously worked with. It is not sufficient to merely ask a student what exercises and tasks they have completed etc.

There is more elsewhere in the Newsletter on the need for record keeping, but this summary

should explain why we feel the need to constantly mention of the state of school records and may perhaps lead to one or two schools

revamping their paperwork. No doubt I'll find out as I do the rounds this season!!!

ACCIDENT? PREVENTION? AND? MEDICAL? PANEL

On looking across the spectrum of incidents and accidents occurring over the past year, once again we see the same old accidents repeated time and time again. We all know and recognise them but I propose to highlight them once more; perhaps we can all put our minds to correcting these faults when we see them - better still, making sure that the lessons are properly taught in school.

"Is my intended airspace clear?"

3. Failure to prepare for landing

This also gives rise to far too many leg, ankle and coccyx injuries; it often happens whilst 'scratching', but can also be due to what I call the 'macho' factor. By this I mean that once you get out of the seat and lower your legs you are telling everyone that you're preparing to land. If you then cock it up you probably feel embarrassed - so in order not to signal the potential cock up, many pilots remain seated until the last possible few seconds. Then, if it does go wrong, they fly on and overshoot pretending that was what they meant to do anyway! This is, to my mind, indecisive flying and I see it all the time among experienced pilots who should know better. I believe that it is much better to decide "right - now I'm going to land"; get the legs down EARLY and carry out a clear, decisive landing.

Let's look at four specific headings :

1. Taking off when the right decision was to stay on the ground ie

Flying in unsuitable weather conditions - probably the most common cause of incidents, accidents and subsequent injury through :-

- a) being dragged by the wind when attempting to land;
- b) being lifted into the air, still facing backwards and with twisted risers;
- c) losing penetration and being blown into hazardous areas;
- d) suffering gust stalls, deflations (and hence spins) and not taking the correct action quickly enough.

4. Failure to keep the head on a swivel!

This doesn't cause too many accidents, but when it does it tends to be serious - sometimes fatal! Mid-air collisions, airproxes, and general mayhem when flying in crowded airspace nearly always caused by failing to look before altering course. Remember - keep those MkII eyeballs swivelling (the MkII eyeball is a MkI that knows what it's looking for).

2. Inadequate preflight check ie

- a) the list of equipment assembly errors or defects is endless. The moral is - CHECK EVERYTHING. (see my article in last years' I & C Newsletter);
 - b) launching into crowded (or, worse still, already occupied) airspace.
- Remember, the last preflight check MUST BE

So - how about picking up on these points this year; emphasise the lessons to be learned at every opportunity when your instructing or coaching; but most important of all PRACTISING THEM YOURSELVES.

Training incident reports

Hang Gliders

Date	Glider type	Description
3.7.96	Hiway Stubby	After a good launch and gentle turns the student held a turn too long and flew into the hill. He suffered a broken collar bone. No rating. 3 similar
1.9.96	Hiway Stubby	A student showed tentative control during low level tow flight, so tow was aborted. As the glider touched down the student stumbled through the A frame and the glider 'nosed' down. The student suf

	ferred a broken arm. No rating.
22.9.96 Airwave Calypso	On a first top-to-bottom flight the student misjudged his approach, slowed too much and stalled the glider at 8ft agl. Fractured rib, nose and whiplash injury. EP rated.
13.10.96 Hiway Stubby	Student pulled bar in on landing - heavy landing trapped finger. Injury: bruised finger
141296 O/pisteDiscovery 195	A strong gust lifted wing tip; glider turned into ridge; needed all pilot's skill to manage fast cross wind, hard, landing. Broken uprights.

Paragliders

060.96 Sportlite 300	Under continual radio instruction and following an emergency release of the tow line the student did not release the hanging line. At 60ft he pulled one control line, went into a spiral dive and struck the ground, suffering spinal and foot fractures. No rating.
4.8.96 ITV Asterope	During ground canopy control exercise, strong localised turbulence caught and lifted the glider and pilot some 15-20 ft, then spun him back into the ground. Both femurs fractured. No rating. 2 similar
11.8.96 Airwave Black Magic.	After a controlled launch and straight flight the student failed to flare and, in landing with legs straight, suffered a broken ankle on impact. No rating. 2 similar
6.9.96 Firebird Dolphin.	Attempting a launch the student tripped on take-off and fell, suffering fractures to an arm. No rating. 2 similar
22.9.96 APCO Prima	On launch the student sat back in the harness too soon causing the glider to sink and deposit him on the ground with one leg under his seat. Fractured leg. No rating.

John Lovel - Panel coordinator

INSURANCE? MATTERS

Claims

For every claim received for compensation in respect of negligence in schools (so far, but it's early days yet, about half a dozen in 1996) we must prepare a detailed investigation report for the Insurers which must be honest and accurate. We cannot hide anything and the report must stand up in Court. The benchmarks which are used are all in the Technical Manual - the syllabuses, Training Programmes, and the Pilot Rating Schemes. In effect, the FSC has said "If you train your students this way then the risk of injury is minimised." So, for instance, if a Training Exercise is left out or taken out of sequence then it becomes very difficult, if not impossible, to offer a defence. Similarly, if there are no school records to back up the training which the student received then it usually ends up as 'his word against yours'; this is not a good start! Hence our emphasis on keeping your own

clear and concise records. Of the last 10 claims which required Reports, half were not able to clearly and unquestionably substantiate the training given. Sometimes (and this happens in far too many schools) the student's own log is meticulously completed - but they then go home with it, and that's the last we see of it because, when there is a claim, his Solicitor snaffles it fast.

So what's the message? There are several :

1. Keep your own Student Record Card for each student
2. Keep a Daily Flight Log as corroborative evidence; other satisfied students present on the day are very powerful supporters
3. In case of injury don't admit liability - but listen carefully to what they say, and if it is 'What a plonker I am for making that stupid mistake' see who is nearest (and heard him) and as soon as possible get a statement to that effect!

4. Fill in the IR form as completely as you possibly can

5. Remember that 'duty of care' extends beyond sending him off in his own car to the local hospital; too many plaintiffs complain of 'nobody seemed to care - they didn't even go to/visit me in the hospital'

6. If you receive the dreaded Solicitor's letter send it fast to the BHPA and let us take the worry away from you. You must not contact the Solicitors except to "acknowledge receipt of your letter which has been forwarded to our Insurers."

7. If, on the other hand, an injured student calls you and accuses you of negligence you can try pointing out firmly (providing, of course, that it is true) that they read and signed the risk warning; that the training they received was in accordance with our manual; and that they were carefully instructed and closely supervised at all times. You should then be in a position to point

out that the cause of their accident was because they failed to follow instructions. Make no other points - do not make any offers of refund or discounted courses as this could be construed as admission of liability.

It doesn't matter how careful you are it won't guarantee not receiving a nasty letter; but the chances of being able to successfully repudiate the claim will be much stronger if you can prove all the points in item 7 above.

Personal Accident cover

We strongly recommend that every school should really consider providing Personal Accident cover for their students - it is available through, amongst others, Airsports Insurance Bureau and gives extra protection which - let's face it, everyone needs in these days of increasing litigation.

Tom Beardsley

INSTRUCTOR? AND? COACH? TRAINING? PANEL

Reserve Parachutes.

You may have seen in Skywings news that the Coach, TI and SI Course programmes have been amended to include information on reserve parachutes - with special regard to packing faults and deployment failures (or faults which would have prevented deployment). Both the Coaching and TI Courses will now include a session on typical faults in both areas - you can then go away and pass on the info on to other pilots. But please be proactive - we suggest that :

A. Instructors run a session for students to prepare them for when they eventually get their reserve

B. Coaches -

i) make a big show of going round on the hill looking at the kit that pilots have and how it's fitted, and

ii) when you run Club Packing nights make sure that you impress the importance, after packing, of fitting the pack to the harness so that it can't be fouled up.

We're so concerned about this reserve thing that we are reintroducing the Parachute Packer qualification as a matter of some urgency - by the time you read this we will have contacted those who showed an interest last time and will

arrange a refresher course. If you're worried about liability, then don't; as long as you're not running a business repacking parachutes then BHPA insurance will be extended to cover the liability - BUT IT'LL BE TIGHT AND YOU MUST ACCEPT THE ADDED RESPONSIBILITY.

Future SI Courses will include an additional module on packing and those completing the course will also get the Packer qualification. But take heed - we will expect you to have some experience of reserves and their packing methods before you attend.

The message is - Let's stop these avoidable errors before someone else dies uselessly!

TI Training

Please note the importance which we place on the practical training which TIs receive - briefly this is in progressive stages :

a) to observe the way the SI trains the students in each of the Exercises

b) to assist the SI in teaching the Exercises

c) to train and supervise his/her own student(s).

We don't want to be forced to designate how long each stage will last as this really rests

in the hands of the CFI - but we offer the following guidelines :

During stage a) the TI could be used :

- as a demonstrator (providing he/she is very, very good);
- to help on wing tethers or wing tips;
- to talk to students to help boost their confidence;
- to note student problems and tell the SI;

No 'stage a' TI should be used where he/she is apart from the SI (such as in the landing field to 'bat' students in).

Stage b) TI's might be used to assist a SI :

- to pre-check students who are in the harness waiting for the SI's briefing;
- to practice briefing students with the SI to correct/check if necessary;
- to be in the landing field and guide students in;

At the end of stage b) he/she must be signed off as being competent to brief students. This is

done for each of the Exercises of the Training Programmes required up to CP, including, where relevant, any additional Exercise indicated on the TI Log Card. Once signed off he needs only be under close SI supervision (visible and within unassisted voice range) whilst training his/her own student(s).

Stage c) TI's still need supervising and their skills improved, and regular checks should be made by SIs that standards are being maintained. During this period they should be continually prepared for their Instructor Examination (see the item in the Exam/Inspection Panel section.

And finally, please don't let the TI's own flying suffer - give him/her every opportunity to stay current.

NOTE - don't forget that TI's must act as a Duty Instructor for 3 separate days during their training.

Tom Beardsley; Mark Dale; Bernard Kane

AND? A? POSTSCRIPT? FROM? THE? CHAIRMAN? FSC

How do you go about teaching someone something?

"If you are trying to teach someone something, first you have to find out what they don't know."

I'll explain. Please give me a little time and think about the following:

Would you agree that if someone is ready to learn something new, then they must already know a lot of background information about the subject?

Pick a subject... let's take Mathematics. We want to teach someone about algebraic equations (you know those things filled with Xs and

Ys, and sometimes a Z or two). Is this the first thing you introduce in Primary School? Why not?

So we agree that you need to lead up to 'complex' things and build on what people know already.

How much background do they need, would you say? Lots about it, or only a little?

I think you said lots.

I agree, in fact I think that it is often the case that the student knows it all already, they just don't realise it. Or if they don't know it all, then there is only a very small thing that they need to have cleared up, then they will understand. So

how do we give them this nugget of knowledge?

Well we could tell them everything we know about the subject, give them a lecture, or a long reading list. Does this work?

You think it does? Really?

If we agree that there is only likely to be a

small thing they don't know, how is the student supposed to recognise the important nugget, in amongst all the other stuff?

OK, so I have persuaded you that swamping them with floods of information is not going to help them find the nuggets.

What else can we try? How can we find out

EMPLOYMENT? NOTICE

"BHPA registered hang gliding Instructor wanted for this season on a full? time basis." Interested? then apply in confidence to:
John Clark CFI
Peak School of Hang Gliding

The Elms Farm
Wetton
Ashbourne
Derbyshire
Tel. 01335 - 310 257

DATES? TO? REMEMBER? IN 1997

Date	Event	Venue
7th April	FSC Meeting	Loughborough
21-22 April	S.I. Course	Holme Pierrepont
7-9 May	T.I. Course	Lilleshall
28-29 June	ALL OUT	Sculthorpe
16th June	FSC Meeting	Holme Pierrepont
11-12 October	Club Coach	Sky Surfing, Petersfield (Sandra Reid 01730 - 263 720)
25-26 October	Club Coach	Offers ?
7th November	CFI Meeting	Loughborough
8th November	FSC Meeting	Loughborough
17-19 November	T.I. Course	Bisham Abbey
20-21 November	S.I. Course	Bisham Abbey
29-30 November	Club Coach	Offers ?
6-7 December	AGM	Telford
8-10 December	T.I. Course	Holme Pierrepont