



# Conversations on Defence Ethics: a Defence Team Learning Event

---

## PARTICIPANTS GUIDE

Series 1 Version 2 / Updated October 18, 2022

DEFENCE **ETHICS** PROGRAMME



# ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Defence Ethics Programme would like to thank the Canadian Defence Academy, the Directorate Professional Military Conduct and ethics advisors for contributing to the material contained in this training manual.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>PART I - DEFENCE ETHICS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
STATEMENT OF DEFENCE ETHICS .....	8
ETHICAL DECISION MAKING MODEL .....	8
<b>PART II – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAY.....</b>	<b>9</b>
BACKGROUND .....	9
INTENT .....	9
<b>PART III – FACILITATION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
WHAT IS FACILITATION? .....	9
<b>PART IV – GUIDELINES AND SCENARIOS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
SCENARIO 1 - INAPPROPRIATE THOUGHTS OR KNOW YOUR AUDIENCE? .....	10
SCENARIO 2A - DIVERSITY AND DIGNITY AT WORK (DND PERSONNEL) .....	10
SCENARIO 2B - DIVERSITY AND DIGNITY AT WORK (CAF VERSION) .....	11
SCENARIO 3 - ASSOCIATION WITH POLITICAL GROUPS OF DOUBTFUL PERSUASION.....	12
SCENARIO 4 - POLITICS ON SOCIAL MEDIA .....	12
SCENARIO 5 - AID TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITY: GOODWILL OR GODSPEED?.....	13
SCENARIO 6 - PARENTING AND PERSONAL TIME: FAIRNESS IN WORKLOAD .....	13
SCENARIO 7 - THE WRITING ON THE WALL.....	14
SCENARIO 8 - REPRISAL FOR ALERT TO SAFETY VIOLATION .....	14
SCENARIO 9 - PRESSURE TO MEASURE UP (CAF ONLY) .....	15
SCENARIO 10 - TIME, RESULTS AND FAIRNESS: AT NDHQ.....	15
SCENARIO 11- THE CAF UNIT DEPARTURE EVENT .....	16
SCENARIO 12- SOCIAL CALLOUT .....	17
<b>EVALUATION FORM .....</b>	<b>18</b>



## PART I

# DEFENCE ETHICS

---

You have a personal set of values and ethics that come from your culture, your heritage and your life experience that helps define and guide you.

The same idea applies to us, the Defence Team.

We have our own unique set of values and ethics that come from our collective culture, heritage and experience. They are deeply rooted in the Canadian identity.

To be part of the Defence Team is to take on its values and ethics and apply them daily.

The Department of National Defence and Canadian Forces Code of Values and Ethics (the Code) identifies three ethical principles, listed in order of priority:



These principles are supported by our five values: integrity, loyalty, courage, stewardship and excellence.

Our Code applies to Department of National (DND) personnel and Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) members equally. It is based on the Values and Ethics Code of the Public Sector and the military ethos set out in Duty with Honour.

We are stronger as individuals and as a team when we are conscious of these principles and values in everything that we do in our professional and personal lives.

Many of the issues we face as an organization and a society – racism, sexual misconduct, abuse, harassment and other inappropriate and damaging behaviors – can be greatly diminished if we use the first principle as our compass in navigating ourselves towards improving our collective ethical conduct.

There is always a reason to talk about ethics.

STEWARDSHIP  
COURAGE  
EXCELLENCE  
INTEGRITY  
LOYALTY

# STATEMENT OF DEFENCE ETHICS

## DEFENCE ETHICS PROGRAMME (DEP)

The Department of National Defence (DND) and the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) are responsible for the defence of Canada, its people and its parliamentary democracy. DND employees and CAF members must be committed in applying the highest ethical standards in all decisions and actions, whether at home or abroad.

[www.canada.ca/defence-ethics](http://www.canada.ca/defence-ethics)  
[ethics-ethique@forces.gc.ca](mailto:ethics-ethique@forces.gc.ca)

### ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND EXPECTED BEHAVIOURS

#### 1. RESPECT THE DIGNITY OF ALL PERSONS

- Treat every person with respect and fairness.
- Value diversity and the benefit of combining qualities and strengths.
- Contribute to harassment and discrimination free workplaces.
- Work together in a spirit of openness, honesty and transparency.

#### 2. SERVE CANADA BEFORE SELF

- Act and make decisions in the public interest.
- Perform your duties and your responsibilities to the highest ethical standards.
- Avoid or prevent situations that could give rise to conflicts of interest.
- Provide open, candid and impartial information, analysis and advice.

#### 3. OBEY AND SUPPORT LAWFUL AUTHORITY

- Respect the rule of law.
- Work objectively and in accordance with legislation, policies and directives.

*(The ethical principles are in order of precedence.)*

### SPECIFIC VALUES AND EXPECTED BEHAVIOURS

#### INTEGRITY

- Maintain everyone's trust in you through your actions.
- Adhere to the highest ethical standards and act with honesty.
- Dedicate yourself to fairness and justice.
- Use your official roles appropriately.
- Prevent and resolve any conflicts of interest.

#### LOYALTY

- Carry out the lawful decisions of your leaders.
- Safeguard information and disclose it only after proper approval.
- Ensure that all personnel are treated fairly.

#### COURAGE

- Face physical and moral challenges with determination and strength of character.
- Make the right choice amongst difficult alternatives.
- Refuse to condone unethical conduct.
- Discuss and resolve ethical issues.

#### STEWARDSHIP

- Use public money, property and resources effectively and efficiently.
- Consider the effects of your actions on people and the environment.
- Acquire, preserve and share knowledge and information as appropriate.
- Provide purpose and direction to motivate personnel to strive for the highest standards.

#### EXCELLENCE

- Improve the quality of policies, programs and services.
- Foster or contribute to an environment that promotes teamwork, learning and innovation.
- Provide fair, timely, efficient and effective services that respect official languages.

*This Aide-memoire is based off of the *Statement of Defence Ethics* and the *DND and CF Code of Values and Ethics*.*

## ETHICAL DECISION MAKING MODEL

### ETHICAL DECISION MAKING



#### PERCEIVE

- What is the problem?
- What are the facts? What are the assumptions? (What? Who? When? Where? Why?)



#### JUDGE AND DECIDE

- What are the obvious courses of action?
- Are there other possible options?
- Which principles, values and results are at play for each option, including the option to do nothing?
- Based on your analysis, decide on the preferred course of action.



#### ACT AND LEARN

- Act upon your decision.
- Be prepared to defend your decision.
- Anticipate conflicting views.
- Learn from your decision.



## PART II

# PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DAY

---

## BACKGROUND

The Deputy Minister (DM) and the Chief of the Defence Staff (CDS) will offer a dignified and respectful apology to the Heyder Beattie class members that acknowledges historic roles and responsibilities in the areas of sexual assault and sexual harassment in order to support efforts towards healing through restorative justice.

The CDS will issue a public apology for those allegations related directly to actions that occurred within the CAF or the Staff of the Non-Public Funds (SNPF), while the DM will do so for individuals previously and currently in an employment relationship with DND. Per the Joint CDS/DM Initiating Directive, the strategic objectives are described as follows:

- To provide a dignified and respectful apology to Class Members that positively contributes to healing; and
- To message to Canadians that the DND/CAF/SNPF recognizes the harm derived of actions of the past and that positive, concrete and unequivocal measures have been undertaken to effect positive change.

## INTENT

The intent is for all Defence Team personnel to discuss and reflect on the ethical foundation of our organization and what this should mean for our conduct, collective practices and culture.

## PART III

# FACILITATION

---

## WHAT IS FACILITATION?

A facilitated discussion is one in which the decision-making power resides with the group. Intergroup dialogue will be key for you to get the most out of the scenarios you will discuss.

The facilitator will help create a climate of collaboration and structure to guide your group through each scenario. In most cases they will not be experts however they have been given tools to help them through the day.

The key to a successful day is engagement and dialogue. Be respectful of everyone's opinions. Challenge the idea not the person and remember that while discussing each scenario it is more about the journey and less about

finding the correct answer. Ethical dilemmas are dilemmas because there are typically numerous potential answers, none of which satisfies all of our competing obligations and beliefs.

Participate, provide feedback and enjoy your day. Every voice is important and this is your chance to be heard.

## PART IV

# SCENARIOS

---

### SCENARIOS

The following scenarios are open-ended in nature. They are deliberately complex to help generate discussion on ethics. They generally do not have simple clear-cut answers, otherwise the discussions would be short and little understanding would be gained.

#### Scenario 1 - Inappropriate thoughts or know your audience?

Lieutenant-Colonel (LCol) Morton is leading a team meeting with his subordinate leadership group. All four managers are men: two are DND employees and two are CAF members.

He brings up the topic of the new employee, a trainer, who will be joining the section.

“She is going to be a great ambassador for our work.” he says. “She is really easy on the eyes and she knows it! When the boys take her training sessions, they will listen to her every word.”

Two of the men glance briefly at each other but say nothing. They walk down the hall together after the meeting.

“You know, that was in bad taste maybe, but he’s not wrong,” says Kevin Robert. “She is very attractive and that will give her an edge when she is trying to engage members on this topic. She won the job competition fair and square. I don’t think even she would have any issue with what the boss just said, based on my conversations with her so far.”

“Does it makes it okay to say you think it’s fair to talk about attractiveness as an outreach tool and a strength of a team member as long as you do it behind the back of anyone who would have an issue with it?” asks Captain Rick Jones.

Is it wrong for LCol Morton to comment on the sexual attractiveness of the new hire as an asset that will help ensure what she says gets attention? Why? Discuss with reference to Defence Ethics, the military ethos and

relevant policies.

#### Objectives

- Understand how opinions of a sexual nature about a co-worker are inappropriate in the workplace and even more so in this case since the leader is addressing subordinates, even if those opinions are positive in nature.
- Observe how sexism can be as subtle as expressing a passing thought. Although it won’t necessarily lead to unsolicited physical advances, it is demeaning and unacceptable in a modern work environment.

#### Scenario 2A - Diversity and dignity at work (DND personnel)

The director announces during a staff meeting that he has hired a new employee, Marielle, to fill a position that has been vacant for one year. He says Marielle is going to be a great fit for the needs of the team.

One of the staff members, Shirley, looks up Marielle’s social media profile, which is public, and sees that she is active in the local XYZ community, which does not believe in same sex marriage. Some of Marielle’s posts include comments in opposition to same sex marriage. Shirley finds one that reads, “I believe that marriage can only be between a man and a woman. I don’t attempt to force my views on people who don’t share them, but I have no intention of keeping my views secret, either.”

This is of concern to Shirley, who does not hide being lesbian and who believes same sex marriage is a human right, just as it is legal. She believes that acceptance of her way of life by others is fundamentally about others respecting her own dignity. Shirley goes to the director to express her concern and find out what he is willing to do to ensure she is not confronted or harassed at work because of who she is.

Shirley’s first proposal to her director is a private discussion between the director and Marielle. If the director is not willing to take that step, Shirley, in a bid to

be transparent, is willing to publicly address the issue at the first staff meeting after Marielle joins the team. (She doesn't indicate what she plans to say.)

If you were the director, how would you handle this request from Shirley?

### Objectives

- This scenario is about balancing freedom of thought with freedom from intimidation and respect for other human beings.
- Understand how expression of views on a social media platform can never be truly private if the person posting can be identified and the post can be seen by strangers or retransmitted by others.
- Understand how respect for the concerns of recognized groups under the Canadian Human Rights Act must be balanced with the idea of freedom of private individual beliefs, where these do not translate into workplace behaviours or speech.
- How this case should be handled by all parties concerned differs between civilian and military contexts, even though the same values and principles should apply in both contexts.
- Explore ways of reassuring all personnel that the workplace is one of respecting the dignity of all persons, which includes respect for their private lives and private beliefs when hateful opinions or actions are not expressed in the workplace.
- Emphasize that uninvited digging into the private lives of co-workers in order to confront people in public is not recommended on the basis of trust and cohesion in teams.

## Scenario 2B - Diversity and dignity at work (CAF version)

The Commanding Officer (CO) announces during a meeting that Master Warrant Officer (MWO) Marielle Brault will be posted in to fill a position that has been vacant for one year. He says MWO Brault will be a great fit for the needs of the team.

One of the staff members of the unit, Captain (Capt) Jana Shirley, looks up MWO Brault's social media profile, which is public, and sees that she is active in the local XYZ community, which does not believe in same sex marriage. Some of MWO Brault's posts include comments in opposition to same sex marriage. Capt Shirley finds one that reads, "I believe that marriage can only be between a man and a woman. I don't attempt to force my views on people who don't share them, but I have no intention of keeping my views secret, either."

This is of concern to Capt Shirley, who does not hide being lesbian and who believes same sex marriage is a human right, just as it is legal. She believes that acceptance of her way of life by others is fundamentally about others respecting her own dignity. Shirley goes to the CO to express her concern and find out what he is willing to do to ensure she is not confronted or harassed at work because of who she is.

Capt Shirley's first proposal to her CO is a private discussion between the CO and MWO Brault. If the CO is not willing to take that step, Capt Shirley, in a bid to be transparent, is willing to publicly address the issue at the first staff meeting after MWO Brault joins the team. (She doesn't indicate what she plans to say.)

If you were the CO, how would you handle this request from Capt Shirley?

### Objectives

- This scenario is about balancing freedom of thought with freedom from intimidation and respect for other human beings, as well as preserving the reputation of the CAF.
- Understand how expression of views on a social media platform can never be truly private if the person posting can be identified and the post can be seen by strangers or retransmitted by others.
- Create or reinforce an understanding for Regular Force CAF members that respect for the concerns of recognized groups under the Canadian Human Rights Act is balanced with the idea of freedom of private individual beliefs only where these do not translate into behaviours or attributable speech inside or outside a CAF environment.

1 "An act or conduct, including the display or communication of words, symbols or images, by a CAF member, that they knew or ought reasonably to have known would constitute, encourage, justify or promote violence or hatred against a person or persons of an identifiable group, based on their national or ethnic origin, race, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, family status, genetic characteristics or disability."

- How this case should be handled by all parties concerned differs between civilian and military contexts, even though the same values and principles should apply in both contexts.
- Be aware that following amendments, DAOD 5019-0 Conduct and Performance Deficiencies, now includes hateful conduct in the context of conduct and performance deficiencies.
- Be aware that the new Military Personnel Instruction on Hateful Conduct defines Hateful Conduct as *“Act or conduct, including the display or communication of words, symbols or images, by a CAF member that they knew or ought reasonably to have known would constitute, encourage, justify or promote violence or hatred against a person or persons of an identifiable group, based on their national or ethnic origin, race, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, marital status, family status, genetic characteristics or disability.”*
- The Military Personnel Instruction on Hateful Conduct obliges all CAF members to report hate incidents, which could include observed social media posts or comments overheard by a member. This applies whether or not the comments were meant for a wide audience.
- Be aware that members of the Regular Force are subject to the Code of Service Discipline and Queen’s Regulations and Orders (QR&O) 24 hours a day, seven days a week. QR&O subpara. 19.14(2)(a): *“No officer or non-commissioned member shall do or say anything that if seen or heard by any member of the public, might reflect discredit on the Canadian Forces or on any of its members...”* Because the CAF is avowedly an institution which supports respecting the dignity of all persons, and according to human rights laws, expression of views by a member at odds with the institutional ideals will come into conflict with duties to the CAF.

### Scenario 3 - Association with political groups of doubtful persuasion

Canada Patriot, a political association founded in Ontario by two former CAF members, claims to be fighting against illegal immigration and radical Islam. Thousands of association members belong to its private Facebook group. The group’s moderators are known to regularly delete comments that incite violence and are overtly

racially violent. External commentators often differentiate Canada Patriot from neo-Fascist, neo-Nazi or white supremacist organizations, and the Ontario Provincial Police doesn’t consider the group to be a threat to law and order.

Master Corporal (MCpl) Dwayne MacDonald is posted to an Army base close to a small town. He has alerted his chain of command that some CAF members wear Canada Patriot t-shirts to the gym during physical training and to the mall in town when off duty.

He interprets the clothing as an expression of anti-immigrant attitudes.

Last week, he overheard someone wearing a Canada Patriot t-shirt say the organization is against illegal immigration, not immigration in general, and there is nothing contrary to Canadian values in opposing what is illegal. Three days ago, he overheard someone else wearing the t-shirt say that there are “more than enough Muslims living here already.”

MCpl MacDonald is asking leadership to explicitly ban the wearing of the t-shirts, both on and off base.

As MCpl MacDonald’s immediate supervisor, how would you handle the discussion?

#### Objectives

- Remind the Defence Team that overt expression of political views at odds with the first principle, Respect the dignity of all persons, is incompatible with DND/CAF ethics and ethos.
- Understand the complexities related to the enforcement of policies against open support for hate groups in DND/CAF.
- Understand how behaviour and language can demonstrate a lack respect for the dignity of others even if it is not in clear violation of a policy.
- Understand how expression of particular political views in the workplace (such as support for one particular group) is on a spectrum from private discussion to more public and overtly incompatible with DND/CAF standards and values, depending on various contextual factors.

## Scenario 4 - Politics on social media

You are a member of a small CAF unit with a diverse combination of backgrounds and you have all become close friends. You and your peers have discussed at length the upcoming high-profile election. Although you have different perspectives, you respect each other's opinions and your friendships remain intact.

While Captain (Capt) Claire Morin, a friend and fellow unit member, has a Facebook account with privacy settings, some information is still open to the public – including a profile picture of her in her CAF uniform, her marital status (married since 2009), amount of friends (1,000) and her hometown (Winnipeg, Manitoba). Her work information and interests are not listed.

You start getting notifications highlighting Capt Morin's posts and comments related to the election.

Three days ago, she shared a video of an interview featuring a political commentator. She added the following comment to the post: "Such a good watch! Summarizes why we need to vote for a candidate who supports a carbon tax. Check it out if you've got six minutes to spare."

Yesterday, she shared a speech by another candidate and asked the following: "Hmm... What do we think of her platform?"

Did Capt Morin violate her professional duties when she posted comments to her Facebook page, particularly when shown there in her CAF uniform? Or would such constraints be at odds with her individual rights and freedoms? How would you handle this situation as either a friend or supervisor?

### Objectives

- Remind all personnel that social media platforms are considered public and political expression within them can only be permissible where the person has a reasonable expectation of a reader not connecting the views expressed to the person's professional identity. (Note: This is consistent with Scenario 2b, in which the post on social media could not be made with a reasonable expectation of privacy because the poster was wearing the CAF uniform.)
- Reaffirm the right of DND personnel and CAF members to exercise their freedom of political belief and expression only when they do so in a manner which takes all reasonable steps to avoid identification of such beliefs or expression with their professional role.

- Understand how there is an inevitable grey area in this matter given the evolving nature of technology and the relevance of a person's rank, uniform and professional identity.

## Scenario 5 - Aid to the civil authority: goodwill or godspeed?

You are deployed on Operation LENTUS, the CAF response to natural disasters in Canada. One of the main efforts is the restoration of the power and communications lines throughout the region.

The CAF is providing logistics, communications and engineering support to Government agencies responsible for those services. In short order, the military assistance is paying dividends with power restored to 50 per cent of those affected after 48 hours.

On day three, the work seems to slow down. You witness workers from a power company telling CAF personnel to slow down because their overtime is getting cut down.

What should you do, and why?

### Objectives

- Understand the significance of stewardship, a Defence Team value.
- Understand that good working relationships between CAF and a civil partner agency may be at odds with a higher duty and loyalty.

## Scenario 6 - Parenting and personal time: fairness in workload

"Good Morning, what are you working on?" asks Master Corporal (MCpl) Pierre Prevot.

"I'm late finalizing the duty roster again," replies Sergeant (Sgt) Barb Cody. "It's been so busy lately."

Sgt Cody and MCpl Prevot work in a Joint Operations Centre (JOC) together and between them supervise several junior ranks. Besides ongoing operations which the staff continually monitor, the JOC has been involved in several training exercises involving the CAF and other government departments. It has been a particularly busy month and they are both trying to catch up to regular but essential administrative tasks.

“The duty roster is just what I was meaning to discuss with you,” says MCpl Prevot. “One of my corporals, Cpl Blair, has noticed – and is grumbling – that he has been tasked with a lot more weekend duties over the last several months than the privates and other corporals. I overheard him complaining to another corporal that he’s carrying the load for your Cpl Chappelle. What gives? Doesn’t Cpl Chappelle have to work the odd weekend too, just like the others?”

“Of course she does, but I give her a break every now and then,” explains Sgt Cody. “She is a single mom with two kids and she was deployed last year.”

“But you’ve got to be fair,” responds MCpl Prevot. “Cpl Blair too has been deployed; twice in the last three years. Is he getting more weekend duties because he’s single and doesn’t have any kids?”

“Well, yes Pierre,” says Sgt Cody. “Since he doesn’t have kids, I consider all of his time outside of work as free time.”

MCpl Prevot thinks about Sgt Cody’s explanation. He has three kids under the age of ten and understands working parents don’t have a lot of free time. He also knows babysitting costs can add up quickly. But he doesn’t think it’s fair that one person gets assigned extra night and weekend duties because of their personal circumstances.

What do you think?

### Objectives

- Understand the broader policy stance of the CAF towards personal responsibilities and needs outside one’s professional role so that the nature of different kinds of personal needs (and whether they are relevant or not to assigned workload) is taken into account in deciding what is fair and equitable treatment.
- Consider how gender assumptions may play into an assessment of one person’s personal needs in comparison to another’s.

## Scenario 7 - The writing on the wall

“Hey, Ron, I heard the major is moving you into the empty captain’s billet,” says Lieutenant (Lt) Yvan Duford. “Now, there’s a position that is not going to get you promoted.”

“Yeah, I know,” replies Captain (Capt) Ron Shadwick, “It’s probably not going to let me keep my high standing on the merit list, either. I just missed getting promoted last year so I’m not happy about this at all. Who would be? It’s a lateral – and I have to train my replacement. How unfair is that?”

“Uh, maybe you already know this, but the word is that the major is not a fan of yours,” Lt Duford continues. “I was at the director’s retirement lunch a few weeks back and I overheard him talking about you to another major. He called you ‘useless’ and said he was going to make sure you didn’t keep ‘fooling’ the chain of command with your ‘supposed’ abilities.”

Major (Maj) Wentworth and Capt Shadwick served together as captains on an early International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) rotation in Afghanistan. Although they didn’t get along too well, they managed to make the best of it and did their jobs as professional soldiers. Maj Wentworth was just promoted and posted in and Capt Shadwick now works for him.

“Well, that’s unfair, but really, what are my options here, Yvan?” asks Capt Shadwick. “He’s the major; it’s his section. If he wants to move me into a position where the work is less challenging and more routine, there isn’t anything I can do about it. I can already tell that my PER this year won’t be like last year’s, before Wentworth.”

“Yeah, but then also being told you have to train your own replacement – that’s pretty low,” says Lt Duford. “And it won’t be the standard two-day handover because your projects are so complicated.”

Capt Shadwick sighs, and then walks away, feeling like he’s been dealt a bad hand.

What do you think?

### Objectives

- Show how malicious gossip and categorical contempt for a person’s performance constitutes abuse and puts that person in a no-win position in the workplace.
- Discuss appropriate communication within the ranks about a person’s performance and what is not.



## Scenario 8 - Reprisal for alert to safety violation

In carrying out her duties as a vehicle technician, Corporal (Cpl) Sam Smith finds that several of her peers cut corners to make repairs to certain vehicles and forgot to do all the safety checks. This situation could jeopardize the safety of the users when they leave the maintenance garage of the unit.

Cpl Smith, concerned with safety and adherence to good procedures, shares her observations with her immediate supervisor, Master Corporal (MCpl) Tim Troudon, in the maintenance platoon. MCpl Troudon listens to her briefly but doesn't pay much attention to her observations.

At the end of the meeting, MCpl Troudon tells her: "Great. Now, get back to your work as soon as possible because our section is already four vehicles behind schedule to repair this week."

Cpl Smith notes that MCpl Troudon will not issue any safety directives or reminders to the unit. She is concerned that the issues she presented were brushed off.

A few days later, Cpl Smith asks to speak directly to her maintenance officer. Her request is immediately denied by MCpl Troudon, who claims that the maintenance officer does not want to know anything about these things and that he is too busy to listen to corporals complain. He tells Cpl Smith to get back to her daily tasks.

The next morning, Cpl Smith tries again to request a meeting with the maintenance officer. MCpl Troudon tells her that she has been assigned to duty next Sunday to backfill for another member of the unit who has an unexpected family obligation.

As Cpl Smith, how would you handle this situation? What if you were MCpl Troudon?

### Objectives

- Demonstrate how hiding a wrongdoing or suppressing information about a safety problem that can cause serious harm is at odds with the principles and values of the Defence Team.
- Understand how reprisal against whistleblowers is at odds with both the Code and the law.

## Scenario 9 - Pressure to measure up (CAF only)

Sergeant (Sgt) Trisha Brown's section is out for a run during a morning physical training session. After the first few hundred meters, Private (Pte) Pete Leclerc finds it increasingly difficult to keep up. As he falls further and further behind, some people in the group begin to make fun of him for being overweight.

Sgt Brown does not intervene and the negative comments continue.

Sgt Brown is unhappy with Pte Leclerc's performance and begins to get impatient. With him well out of ear shot, she too starts to say disparaging comments against him that the other members of her section can easily hear.

What considerations are at play here with respect to Defence Ethics and the military ethos? How should Sgt Brown have dealt with this situation?

### Objectives

- Consider how criticism of a member's bodily capacities is at odds with respecting the dignity of a person and constitutes both humiliation and disloyalty. It is not a suitable motivational tool to improve subordinate performance, whereas positive reinforcement is both supportive and more effective.
- Observe that disparaging or ridiculing a member's deficient capacities to others, even behind the person's back, is an unacceptable form of disrespect and harassment.
- Understand the difference between substandard conduct that is based on unethical attitudes (e.g. lack of motivation or a wish to take advantage of others) and sub-standard conduct based on remediable and unintended deficiencies.

## Scenario 10 - Time, results and fairness: at NDHQ

At National Defence Headquarters (NDHQ) in Ottawa, Lieutenant-Colonel (LCol) Paula Ali runs a unit comprised of DND employees and CAF members. The organizational chart is layered: some CAF members report to DND employees and some DND employees report to CAF members.

The office provides an internal client service open daily from 0700-1700.

The two client service agents who respond to inquiries are DND employees. They have staggered work and lunch hours (of a half hour each) to ensure there is always someone available to respond to inquiries.

Frank Chu, a program manager, supervises both the client service agents and Major (Maj) Penny Pod, a report-writer. Frank works 0800 to 1600 but lately he's been staying until 1700 and working on weekends to keep up with the workload.

Maj Pod works from 0700 to 1500. She spends one and a half hours in the gym every morning, takes an hour for lunch and teleworks on Mondays. One of her children has behavioural issues and she occasionally has to leave work abruptly to go to his school. She doesn't go to all military events she is expected to attend and doesn't return to work after weekly Friday lunches at the mess.

Karl Klass, a program analyst, works from 0800 to 1600. He reports directly to LCol Ali and has no staff to supervise. He frequently attends off site meetings and, due to the nature of his work, can do most of his work remotely. He does not often spend a full day at the office. LCol Ali is satisfied that he is getting the results needed.

Corporal (Cpl) Ahmed Hassan, a Human Resources Advisor, spends a lot of time chatting with people in the office. He volunteers on all committees, including the charitable causes. Some people say he talks too much and is a bit peculiar, but they know that some of the committees probably wouldn't exist without him. He reports to Maj Pod, who seems to have no problem with his schedule. Maj Pod is the only one who is aware of Cpl Hassan's mental health issues.

Cpl Hassan is chatting with one of the client service agents, Marta, one day.

"You seem pretty busy lately, Marta, with the spike in requests!" he says. "It must be hard to relax when you only have half an hour for lunch.

I know that the Public Service employees have collective agreements for you folks that state how long you can take on breaks but it's interesting how other employees who work here seem to be free to take longer lunches. I think the managers really ought to have a meeting with

everybody and remind them of the agreement, because we need to share the workload more fairly in this place.

What do you think?

## Objectives

- Understand how the nature of someone's professional role is relevant to the way in which they do their work, despite collective agreements.
- Acknowledge that formal rules of employment for civilians are applied to the letter in lower trust environments and that most teams have a preference for flexibility where there is sufficient trust in the abilities and motivations of all team members to get the work done properly and on time without necessarily exact adherence to the terms of work.
- Discuss the difference between civilian and military terms of service and norms, including the need for a sound work ethic and the value of flexibility and trust in both worlds; and to arrive at an understanding of different forms of leave, different priority given to physical fitness, etc., comparing military and civilian work forces.
- Acknowledge the need for collective understanding and transparency where mixed teams are to perceive each other in a fair way.

## Scenario 11- The CAF unit departure event

You are a new civilian employee at a Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) unit. You are at a departure event at a popular restaurant off-base for a well-liked CAF member of the team. It is 1600 hours and everyone is having a good time. A senior officer approaches you and your co-worker, a junior military member, while you are talking and says "hey good looking" and tightly hugs your co-worker – who freezes. You sense from their body language that they seem to be uncomfortable with the situation and you are offended by this unprofessional behavior.

Later that evening, while the same co-worker is saying goodbye to everyone and preparing to depart, you notice as the senior officer intercepts them and says "No. No. Stay and enjoy the rest of the evening." You again sense that they feel uncomfortable and ask them if they are ok with the situation. The co-worker responds that this isn't the first time and they are used to this behaviour.



The next day, you see the senior officer and recall their behaviour. You are still offended and bring up it up with military co-workers. You are shocked when they adamantly defend the senior officer. You feel lost in this situation.

\*This scenario has been developed by the Directorate of Professional Military Conduct (DPMC).

### Objectives

- Identify warning signs of potential sexual misconduct situations.
- Understand how actions of a sexual nature towards unit members are inappropriate in the workplace.
- Understand how behaviour and language can demonstrate a lack respect for the dignity of others, are demeaning and are unacceptable in a modern work environment.
- Describe how suppressing a wrongdoing or suppressing information about inappropriate behaviour is at odds with the principles and values of the Defence Team.
- Discuss the difference between civilian and military terms of service and norms, including the need for a sound work ethic and professional values, as well as the duty to report.
- Review available DND/CAF resources on inappropriate sexual behaviour.
- Discuss the following Guiding Principles (GP) in the CAF's The Path to Dignity and Respect:
  - o GP 1: Zero Tolerance
  - o GP 2: Leader commitment at all levels
  - o GP-3: CAF Personnel will understand and embody the CAF military ethos
  - o GP-4: Persons affected by sexual misconduct will be empowered as supported partners, and treated fairly and compassionately.

## Scenario 12- Social callout\*

You are reasonably new to the military and spend many of your evenings surfing the web and viewing social media. One evening you notice a recent anonymous post on a popular social media site you often visit that accuses a Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) member from your unit of sexual misconduct towards other members of your unit. You are shocked because you have never witnessed this type of behaviour, nor heard rumours to substantiate such a bold claim.

\*This scenario has been developed by the Directorate of Professional Military Conduct (DPMC).

### Objectives

- Reaffirm the right of DND personnel and CAF members to exercise their freedom of belief and expression but only when they do so in a manner which takes all reasonable steps to avoid identification of such beliefs or expression with their professional role.
- Understand how there is an inevitable grey area in this matter given the evolving nature of technology and the relevance of a person's rank, uniform, and professional identity.
- Discuss how malicious gossip and categorical contempt for a person's performance constitutes abuse and puts that person in a no-win position in the workplace.
- Discuss the following Guiding Principles (GP) in the CAF's The Path to Dignity and Respect:
  - o GP 4: Persons affected by sexual misconduct will be empowered as supported partners, and treated fairly and compassionately.
  - o GP 5: Respondents will be assured of due process, and treated fairly and proportionally.

# EVALUATION FORM

Conversations in Defence Ethics (CODE): a Defence Team Learning Event Participant Form

Your feedback is important. The data collected is anonymous and only identifies your Level One (L1) organization. It will be used for the continued development and effectiveness of future learning events. Aggregate information at the Defence Team wide level and the L1 level (if requested) will be shared internally. You may fill out this paper form and return it to your facilitator or fill out the e-form via the link provided by your facilitator.

You are a: DND employee \_\_\_\_ CAF member \_\_\_\_ CFMWS employee \_\_\_\_

L1 Organization your unit reports to: \_\_\_\_\_

The scenarios you completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Stand-alone issues discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

## 1. Intent

The CODE supported the intent of the event: to have open discussions and reflect on the ethics foundations of our organizations, and our conduct, collective practices and culture.

NO (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) YES

## 2. Quality and organization of the training

The CODE scenarios and discussions were relevant to your environment.

NO (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) YES

The discussions developed in such a way that there were new insights among the participants.

NO (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) YES

The CODE instructional guide was sound.

NO (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) YES

The CODE event was well paced in the allotted time.

NO (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) YES

The facilitator was able to foster a valuable group conversation on ethics.

NO (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) YES

## 3. Overall impression

How worthwhile did you personally find this learning event compared to other learning events of similar length?

Bad (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Great

## 4. Do you have additional feedback? \_\_\_\_\_

*If you have further feedback, concerns or questions, please contact [Ethics-Ethique@forces.gc.ca](mailto:Ethics-Ethique@forces.gc.ca) and we will respond to you personally. This feedback will not be shared beyond DEP without your consent.*

*Thank you for participating.  
~ The Defence Ethics Programme*