



Scenario: Passing the Problem

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 \(EAP\)](#).

Both Warrant Officer (WO) Bill Haswell and WO Louis Barteau are platoon warrants in an infantry regiment.

“Hey, Louis! You look frustrated. What’s up?” asks WO Haswell.

“It’s Corporal (Cpl) Stanford again,” says WO Barteau. “I knew was trouble when he showed up last posting season.”

“What’s he done this time, Louis?” WO Haswell asks.

“He wants to be an Intelligence Operator (INT OP) and is requesting a Voluntary Occupational Transfer (VOT) to the Intelligence Branch,” replies WO Barteau. “His bad attitude, constant excuses and sick leave make that I’d be glad to get rid of him. In the short time he’s been here, he’s been dragging down my platoon and negatively influencing the troops.”

“So, what’s the problem, Louis? If Stanford shouldn’t be wearing our cap badge, then recommend him for the transfer out of the infantry and let him be somebody else’s problem,” WO Haswell suggests.

“Yeah, but Cpl Lee has also requested a transfer to become an INT OP,” replies WO Barteau. “I’ve been delaying a little on Lee because he’s one of the best soldiers I’ve ever had. There’s also a chance he may not make the cut into Intelligence since he’s two courses shy of his high school qualification, though he’s expecting to complete one more soon. Stanford, on the other hand, does have his high school and has completed a couple of college-level courses. Lee is really smart, hardworking and deserves the opportunity – not Stanford. But if I recommend Cpl Lee to the company commander and he gets the transfer, I’m stuck with Cpl Stanford and all the headaches he’s going to cause.

“Louis, I say recommend Stanford and get rid of him,” WO Haswell advises. “Lee will get his turn in the future.”

“You’re probably right, Bill, but I’m sure going to get creative in order to write up Stanford in my recommendation to the company commander,” says WO Barteau. “And what about passing my problem on to someone else?”

Categories

Principles:	Serve Canada before self, Obey and support lawful authority
Values:	Integrity, Loyalty, Stewardship
Cultural Themes:	Service, Leadership, Teamwork
Misconduct Types:	General Misconduct
GBA Plus Themes:	Not Specific
Audience:	Canadian Armed Forces

Facilitator's Guide

Learning Objectives:

- Discuss the ethical obligation of Serve Canada before self and Obey and support lawful authority in this setting.
- Discuss the ethical values of integrity, loyalty, and stewardship loyalty in this scenario.

Facilitation Questions:

1. What is the problem in this scenario?
 - Open group discussion.
 - WO Barteau is faced with balancing his responsibilities to his unit, the welfare of his subordinates, and maintaining integrity and honesty in his assessments of two individuals applying for a VOT.
2. What considerations are at play with respect to Defence Ethics and the military ethos?
 - Open group discussion.
 - Discuss the ethical principles of Serve Canada before self and Obey and support lawful authority in this setting.
 - Discuss the tensions around loyalty in this scenario. Should loyalty affect WO Barteau's decision?
 - Discuss elements of stewardship, including how WO Barteau's decision can impact personnel and the CAF in the present and future as well as his responsibility as a leader to motivate personnel to strive for the highest standards in performance.
3. Is it ethical to prioritize one soldier (Cpl Lee) over another (Cpl Stanford) for a VOT based on wanting to retain the "better soldier"? Open group discussion.
 - From a fairness perspective, Cpl Lee's dedication and potential should be recognized. As well, Cpl Stanford might have the right qualifications needed for the intelligence branch. Both should be assessed with these in mind. Falsifying information in personnel assessments and/or recommendations does not demonstrate integrity and is unethical.
 - What performance management strategies could Louis adapt to support Cpl Standford?
4. What possible action(s) could WO Barteau take in this scenario?
 - Open group discussion.
 - Option 1: Recommend Cpl Stanford for VOT. This would allow him to address the disruptive influence in his platoon and potentially meet the eligibility criteria for the Intelligence Branch. However, WO Bariteau will need to falsify the Cpl's performance to date.
 - Option 2: Recommend Cpl Lee for VOT. This would reward Cpl Lee's dedication and high performance, even if he lacks the required qualifications. It would align with promoting merit. Performance management strategies for Cpl Stanford would be beneficial.
 - Option 3: Provide honest assessment of both Cpls. WO Barteau can provide honest and transparent assessments for both Cpl Lee and Cpl Stanford, reflecting their qualifications, performance, and behaviour.