



## Scenario: Playing the Game

### 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 \(EAP\)](#).*

You have been selected to serve as a member of a merit board reviewing files for the Commissioning from the Ranks (CFR) program. During the process, you notice a discrepancy in the records for one of the nominated non-commissioned members (NCMs). In the letter of recommendation, her supervisor described the individual as the strongest performer. However, on the individual's most recent Performance Appraisal Report (PAR), the same supervisor did not rank her as the top performer. None of the other board members have commented upon this inconsistency. As luck would have it, you have worked and socialized with the individual's supervisor. You excuse yourself from the board and phone your old colleague.

Your colleague confirms that the individual was, indeed, the best performer. However, due to restrictions imposed by their chain of command, only one person could receive "Exceeds Expectations" on their competencies. During a meeting, your colleague was cautioned by the Branch Head not to waste high assessments for newly promoted personnel, and he was directed to give the individual "Meets Expectations" for all competencies. You are astonished. You feel that the individual has been treated unfairly and suspect that her chances for commissioning will now be jeopardized by this decision. Before hanging up, your friend asks that you not say anything because he is concerned that it might get back to his boss.

#### Categories

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

# Facilitator's Guide

## Learning Objectives:

- Discuss the ethical obligation of “Respect the Dignity of all Persons” in the workplace.
- Discuss the ethical values of loyalty, integrity, courage, and excellence in the workplace.

## Facilitation Questions:

1. What would you do in this situation? What are the considerations?
  - Allow open discussion from the group.
  - Ethical concerns: You are concerned that the individual was not properly assessed on a previous Performance Appraisal Report (PAR). In your opinion, the Branch Head has behaved in an unfair manner by penalizing the individual on PAR ranking.
  - Personal factors: Since you know the reasons for the discrepancy, you feel that the individual has not been treated fairly. You feel that this information should be shared with the other board members, but your colleague asked you not to say anything.
  - Environmental factors: The other members of the Commission from the Ranks (CFR) merit board are not aware of the reasons for the discrepancy.
2. What is the ethical dilemma in this situation?
  - While you want to remain loyal to your colleague, you now hold a piece of information that is vital to the board selection process.
  - You cannot change what happened to the PAR ratings, but you do have a responsibility to disclose the information to the other board members, thus ensuring that every individual is assessed fairly.
3. What are some potential courses of action that could be taken in this scenario?
  - Option 1: Disregard your colleague plea for confidentiality and disclose the information. As a result, this might create tension between you and your colleague. There may also be repercussions for your colleague if his boss discovers that he has disclosed the details.
  - Option 2: Do not disclose the information. As a result, the individual might be unfairly assessed during the selection procedures.