



Scenario: Only One

Group Size: 4-15

This scenario may contain explicit language and references to harmful situations which may be emotionally activating for some people. If you need support, services are available through the [CAF Member Assistance Program \(CFMAP\)](#) and the [Employee Assistance Program \(EAP\)](#).

“Sir, thanks for meeting with me. I tried to sort this out with Captain (Capt) Fung, but she is not budging,” says Major (Maj) Mark Dryden. “No problem, Mark,” responds Lieutenant-Colonel (LCol) Steve Franks. “Let’s see if we can come up with a solution.”

LCol Franks is the Commanding Officer (CO) of a large Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) Administrative unit. He is responsible for several sections, dozens of CAF members, and Department of National Defence (DND) employees and it is Performance Appraisal Report (PAR) time. Maj Dryden and Capt Amy Fung are both section heads.

“Sir, as our unit was directed, this year we can only have one PAR with an overall performance of “Far Exceeds Leadership Expectations” for the rank of Master Warrant Officer (MWO),” explains Maj Dryden. “Capt Fung is adamant that MWO Browne from her section receive that PAR. From what I’ve seen, MWO Browne is extremely effective and exceptional at his job.

However, MWO Vlassov is just as exceptional, if not better, and I’ve written her up as “Far Exceeds Leadership Expectations” as well. In fact, I pointed out to Capt Fung that MWO Vlassov has not only earned “Far Exceeds Leadership Expectations” during this reporting period but should be recommended for the Commissioning from the Ranks Plan (CFRP). We’ve been back and forth on this, but Capt Fung and I are at a deadlock.”

LCol Franks reads the draft PARs for the two MWOs and agrees that both seem very deserving. The substantiations provided by Maj Dryden and Capt Fung clearly support the rating of “Far Exceeds Leadership Expectations” of their MWOs, but the direction for the unit rankings is clear – only one “Far Exceeds Leadership Expectations” PAR per rank. LCol Franks is not sure what to do.

Finally, the CO believes they have an answer to this dilemma and gives the nod to MWO Vlassov. Not surprisingly, Capt Fung is disappointed and meets with LCol Franks.

“LCol Franks, could I inquire as to how you reached your decision?” asks Capt Fung.

LCol Franks explains, “First, I remembered that MWO Browne has been talking about putting in his release in the next year or two. I also recalled that MWO Vlassov is much younger and, therefore, has more productive years left to offer. As you know, Maj Dryden is also recommending MWO Vlassov for CFRP.”

Capt Fung leaves the meeting dissatisfied.

Categories

- Principles: Serve Canada before self, Obey and support lawful authority
- Values: Integrity, Courage, Stewardship
- Cultural Themes: Service, Identity
- Misconduct Types: General Misconduct
- GBA Plus Themes: Age
- Audience: Canadian Armed Forces

Facilitator's Guide

Learning Objectives:

- Discuss the ethical principles of Respect the dignity of all persons and Obey and support lawful authority in this setting.
- Discuss the values of stewardship, courage, and integrity in this scenario.
- Discuss discrimination and bias factors in PARs.

Facilitation Questions:

1. What is the problem in this scenario?
 - Open group discussion.
 - Is the direction in this scenario to limit the “Far Exceeds Leadership Expectations” in this scenario ethical?
 - Was it fair for LCol Franks to decide on the future potential of MWO Browne and MWO Vlassov based on factors like age and potential retirement.
2. What considerations are at play with respect to Defence Ethics and the military ethos?
 - Open group discussion.
 - Discuss the ethical obligation of Respect the dignity of all persons and Obey and support lawful authority in this setting.
 - Discuss stewardship as it relates to the following two professional expectations: Provide purpose and direction to motivate personnel both individually and collectively to strive for the highest standards in performance; and ensure resources are in place to meet future challenges. How will this decision impact the moral of the individuals, leaders and teams?
3. Should factors such as a person's age be considered/discussed during annual PAR activities (unit ranking boards, etc.)? Why or why not?
 - Open group discussion.
 - The decision to consider factors such as age, potential future service/possible release, or retirement could be seen as unfair as it does not directly relate to the performance during the reporting period. The decisions should strictly adhere to established criteria and guidelines set out at the start of the process, which would be fair and transparent to all.
 - Is it beneficial to the Unit/CAF to award the person who has more years remaining to serve in uniform than the one retiring, when both have performed equally?
4. What courses of action would you recommend for Capt Fung to take in this scenario?
 - Option 1: Discuss with both LCol Frank and Maj Dryden again. Strongly highlighting those factors such as age or individuals' future plans, such as release, could be seen as unfair and subsequent recourse such as grievances could ensue.
 - Option 2: Accept the CO's decision. Points were argued and the CO made the decision. All will have to live with the consequences of the decision.

Option 3: Seek guidance from others, such as a higher authority, colleagues, or other resources. Capt Fung could explore formal procedures to appeal decisions (such as Alternate Dispute Resolutions, for example).