



Scenario: Credit Where Credit is Due

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 \(EAP\)](#).

Petty Officer, 2nd Class (PO 2) Francklin, new to the unit, stands beside PO2 Bordeaux on parade during monthly divisions at a Navy school. Both watch as their section Officer in Command (OC), Lieutenant (Navy) (Lt(N)) Peakman, is called forward to accept an award.

“Congratulations,” says the school commandant, presenting him the Commandant’s Bravo Zulu Award. “Your innovative redesign of Seamanship Division’s replenishment at sea (RAS) trainer will make training safer and more realistic and will save the school significant training time!”

“Hmph,” mutters PO2 Bordeaux, “There he goes again!”

Later at coffee, Francklin approaches Bordeaux. “What’s up, Rollie? You’re not celebrating, and you seemed unhappy with the BZ being awarded to the section OC.”

“You mean you didn’t know?” PO2 Bordeaux replies. “Peakman had nothing to do with redesigning the RAS trainer. It was all the work of your subordinate, Master Sailor (MS) Waters. The sum of Peakman’s contribution was to take the credit and get the award, something he’s well known for around these parts! Everybody but the commandant knows it.”

Francklin later asks around and finds out that Bordeaux’s allegation is completely factual. MS Waters, a creative and intelligent young boatswain, had been working on redesigning the trainer since joining the unit three years ago, when she witnessed a training accident that could have caused very serious injuries.

PO2 Francklin considers the situation: MS Waters should get credit for her work. Francklin has been told the commandant is a scrupulously fair officer, but also knows he insists on the strict use of the divisional system. Francklin has little faith in the impartiality of their divisional officer, Lt(N) Peakman. Francklin also wonders if sexism could be at play in this situation.

Categories

Principles:	Respect the Dignity of all Persons
Values:	Integrity, Loyalty, Courage, Excellence
Cultural Themes:	Identity, Leadership, Teamwork
Misconduct Types:	Not Specific
GBA Plus Themes:	Rank
Audience:	Canadian Armed Forces

Facilitator's Guide

Learning Objectives:

- Discuss the ethical principle of “Respect the Dignity of all Persons” in this scenario.
- Discuss the ethical values of integrity, loyalty, courage, and excellence.
- Discuss the perception of unfairness in the workplace.

Facilitation Questions:

1. What is the problem in this scenario?
 - Open group discussion.
2. What considerations are at play with respect to Defence Ethics?
 - Open group discussion.
 - Discuss the ethical principle of “Respect the Dignity of all Persons” in this scenario.
 - Discuss the ethical values of integrity, loyalty, courage, and excellence in this scenario.
3. In hierachal institutions such as the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF), leadership gets often gets credited with the accomplishments of their teams. Is this practice unfair? Why or why not?
 - Open group discussion.
 - How has sexism and ageism played a part in reinforcing this practice in the CAF? How has the history of women in the CAF, and sexism in the CAF, played a role in allowing situations such as these to happen?
4. If you were the PO2 in this situation, what would you do?
 - Open group discussion.
 - Option 1: Ignore it. Our POs, like most people, probably would prefer to avoid confrontation. They likely feel a confrontation with Lt(N) Peakman would create long-lasting negative effects that would strain the loyalty and friendliness of their current relationship. However, to do nothing would be the least effective decision and would also be harmful. If the POs refuse to act, Lt(N) Peakman’s unfair actions would go unchecked, which would corrode the work environment. All of this would compromise the faith of section members in their leaders and would undermine team cohesiveness.
 - Option 2: Discuss with Lt(N) Peakman. PO2s Bordeaux and Francklin could at least give Lt(N) Peakman the opportunity to fix his mistake and learn from it. Rather than leaving things as they are, a sincere effort to reintroduce fairness and integrity into an unfair situation would go a long way towards rectifying the apparent wrong. For example, PO2 Francklin could approach Lt(N) Peakman and encourage him to address, in some public way, the obvious unfairness of the situation.
 - Option 3: Bring it up to the Commandant. Lt(N) Peakman would very likely be reminded of his obligation to maintain the ethical integrity of the divisional chain. That could be done by showing due care for the welfare of subordinates, by treating them with fairness and respect, and by properly and publicly recognizing their work and accomplishments.