

DRAFT

REQUIRED STAFF TRAINING STUDENT GUIDE

A positive approach to leadership
CAP PAMPHLET 52-12 Volume 2 February 2012



DRAFT

REQUIRED STAFF TRAINING STUDENT GUIDE

CAP Pamphlet 52-12 Volume 2

February 2012

CAPP 52-12 provides materials for instructors and students of the Required Staff Training course. Completion of this course is required for staff members (both cadets and senior members) at cadet activities lasting 4 nights or longer, as referenced in CAPR 52-16, *Cadet Program Management*. With time for ORM analysis, group discussion, and 2-3 case studies, the estimated time to complete this course is 90 minutes.

This course supersedes CAPP 52-12 dated June 2002.

PRINCIPAL AUTHOR

Capt **Jackie Briski**, CAP, *Virginia Wing*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Course Overview	1
Introduction: First, Do No Harm	1
Cadet Protection Paradigm	2
Appropriate Intensity Levels	3
Definition of Abuse	4
Definition of Hazing	4
The Spirit and the Letter	4
Reporting Procedures	6
Planning Ahead	7
Case Studies	8
Motivation	8
The Bottom Line	8

DRAFT

Course Overview

According to CAPR 52-16, *Cadet Program Management*, the key traits of CAP cadet life are the uniform, aerospace theme, opportunity to lead, challenge, and fun. Many leaders of cadets are eager to embrace the “challenge” aspect of the Cadet Program, but are unsure of the most effective way of doing it.

The Required Staff Training (RST) program is designed to equip leaders of cadets to administer and oversee the Cadet Program in a way that challenges cadet to achieve more while ensuring an environment that is safe—physically, mentally, and emotionally—in order to maximize training value.

This Student Guide is designed to be an additional learning resource. The layout includes wide margins so you can take notes and record your thoughts throughout the training. Some sections of the Student Guide include fill-in-the-blank sentences and images that align with slides in the PowerPoint presentation to help with note-taking.

“Leaders foster a culture that emphasizes a team mentality while maintaining high standards and accomplishing the mission.” ~ AFDD 1-1 (2006)

Introduction: First, Do No Harm

Some leaders of cadets feel that the Cadet Protection Policy (CPP) limits their ability to conduct training, “dumbing down” the Cadet Program and making it too easy for cadets. This attitude misses the point of the CPP—not to mention leadership—entirely.

The CPP is not about making the Cadet Program “soft.” It’s about promoting good leadership while accomplishing goals more effectively. The CPP is designed to protect cadets, not to limit leaders. In fact, your primary responsibility as a leader is to take care of your followers. You aren’t taking care of your followers if you’re allowing abuse or hazing to occur. Therefore, a leader’s primary responsibility is to ***First, Do No Harm.***

First, Do No Harm.

Primum Non Nocere is a Latin phrase that means “First, do no harm”. It is an important concept in the field of medical ethics that drives the decisions made by doctors as they determine the best way to treat their patients.

Similarly, if a leader’s primary responsibility is to take care of his or her followers, they must make a commitment to ***First, Do No Harm.***

DRAFT

Worded differently, it's really not a matter of "How far is too far?" to see what we can get away with under the CPP. **It's a matter of doing what's right and taking care of your followers.** CAP expects a high standard of professionalism from all of its members, but this is especially true for those trusted to lead cadets.

Cadet Protection Paradigm

The primary purpose of the Cadet Protection Policy is to:

The Air Force Officer Accession and Training Schools (AFOATS) Training Guide, complete with a Five-Step Leadership Development Process, was written to standardize the training paradigm for all USAF commissioning sources—the Air Force Academy, Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps, and Officer Training School. The Five-Step Leadership Development Process is based on creating **a culture of mutual trust and respect** between instructor and trainee.

To maximize performance and training effectiveness, good leaders strive to earn the trust and respect of their followers. In order to truly trust and respect their leaders, there must be no shadow of a doubt in the followers' minds that their leaders truly care about them. This is the very heart of servant leadership, and it is the reasoning behind the AFOATS training model—and, subsequently, the Air Force training paradigm.

CAP leaders may refer to the AFOATS Five-Step Leadership Development Process, in conjunction with CAPR 52-10, *CAP Cadet Protection Policy*, to determine appropriate training practices within the CAP Cadet Program.

AFOATS Five-Step Leadership Development Process



DRAFT

Appropriate Intensity Levels

As previously mentioned, the key traits of CAP cadet life are the uniform, aerospace theme, opportunity to lead, challenge, and fun. It is important to note that while “challenge” and “fun” are not mutually exclusive, challenges are not always fun in the moment. In order to balance the Cadet Program goals of

Emotional Arousal
There's a difference between being nervous and being scared. It's natural to feel nervous when you want to meet tough expectations, when you're out of your comfort zone, when you're asked to perform under pressure, or when you want to earn the respect of your leaders. But followers should never dread the consequences of failing to meet their leader's expectations, and they should never fear for their safety when they let their leaders down.
Being nervous increases ability to perform. Being scared decreases ability to perform.

providing training experiences that are both challenging and fun, leaders must identify the appropriate intensity level for a given activity.

Depending on the type of activity, leaders have different options at their disposal for increasing and decreasing the level of intensity. However, it's important to remember to **First, Do No Harm**.

Leaders need to maintain a high level of awareness regarding the stress levels of each individual follower for two primary reasons. First, this social awareness equips the leader to take care of her followers. Second, it allows the leader to more effectively evaluate training progress.

Increasing the level of intensity for individual followers—especially in the use of time restraints—is typically most effective when used together with an increased emphasis on teamwork. In this way, cadets learn to support and rely on one another while working together to accomplish the assigned tasks.

It's important to note that what's slightly stressful for one cadet might completely overwhelm another. This is not to say that hazing is completely subjective, based entirely on whether or not an individual cadet can “take it;” rather, it means that leaders need to be aware of how different people respond to pressure. The best leaders spend time getting to know each individual follower so they can identify individual “pressure points” and help their followers with stress management.

(Note: See CAPP 52-23, Cadet Protection Policy Implementation Guide, for more information.)

DRAFT

Definition of Abuse

“Sexual abuse is defined as sexual molestation, touching, contact, exposure, suggestions, or other incidents of a sexually oriented nature.”

“Physical abuse is defined as any conduct whereby someone physically strikes or assaults another in any way.”

The Cadet Protection Policy prohibits three types of abuse: physical abuse, sexual abuse, and hazing. Cadet Programs officers tend to focus on hazing, but the other types of abuse cannot be ignored. These abuse definitions are taken from CAPR 52-10, *CAP Cadet Protection Policy*.

Definition of Hazing

The Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program has adopted the standard Department of Defense policy on hazing:

“Hazing is defined as any conduct whereby someone causes another to suffer or to be exposed to any activity that is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful.”

While CAP has adopted the DoD definition of “hazing”, it’s important to note that CAP interprets the definition differently because the Cadet Program has different training goals. CAPR 52-10 *Cadet Protection Policy* provides more specific guidance on some of these differences.

The Spirit and the Letter

When interpreting rules and regulations, a leader must consider two paradigms: the letter of the law and the spirit of the law. The *letter* is the words and their literal meaning; the *spirit* is the underlying meaning or the big picture behind those words.

If the **Letter** is “cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful,” what is the **Spirit**?

Instructors who are tasked with training cadets have a variety of roles that they must fill. Part of leadership is determining which situations call for which role.

DRAFT

Roles of an Instructor
Sometimes you need to be a strong—but caring and compassionate— LEADER who can get them to follow you.
Sometimes you need to be an organized, resourceful MANAGER to know what to do with them once they are following you.
Sometimes you need to be an effective, efficient BRIEFER to make them responsible for information.
Sometimes you need to be a good TEACHER , to convey knowledge.
Sometimes you need to be a hard TRAINER , to get them to act decisively in hard times.

It's important to note that not every incident of the wrong role in the wrong situation is a CPP violation. It's easy to be a bad leader without hazing anyone.

When it comes to the CPP, it's not enough to just memorize the letter of the law. The best leaders understand and embrace the spirit of the law. The Rule of St. Benedict provides a good overview of the spirit of cadet protection:

“Arrange everything so that the _____ have something to _____, and the _____ nothing to _____.”

This means striving to create an atmosphere where the cadets who are already performing well still seek to do better, but the cadets who need a little more help are not afraid and do not dread continued failure to perform well.

DRAFT

Reporting Procedures

When leaders of cadets witness or suspect a violation of the CPP, they are responsible to do two things. First, if possible, they need to intervene to stop the abuse if it is still happening. Second, they are responsible for reporting the incident to a higher authority. This is where the chain of command comes in.

Sometimes it's impractical (or even impossible) for a leader to intervene personally when they become aware of a CPP violation. The best thing to do in

If not you, who?

The **Bystander Effect** refers to a psychological phenomenon in which the average person is less likely to intervene in a situation when they think that others will respond. The most famous example is the story of *Kitty Genovese*, who was brutally murdered in 1964. She screamed throughout the 45-minute attack, but no one tried to stop the man who was killing her. Later, 12 people reported that they had actually witnessed the murder, but they all chose not to call the police because they assumed that somebody else would. Up to 38 people heard her screams and did nothing.

Leaders stand up for what's right, even when everyone else around them is content to keep right on sitting.

these situations is to report the incident as soon as possible, so the situation can be handled appropriately.

In the past, many of the CPP violations that have occurred were a direct result of a good leader making a bad decision in the heat of the moment. If you realize that you've crossed the line, it's important to take responsibility and do what you can to make things right. There might still be consequences, but the best leaders always take responsibility for their behavior.

It's also important to note that leaders must report CPP violations even if no one "feels" as though they've been hazed. For instance, even if a cadet or group of cadets state that they don't mind incentive physical training, it's still a violation of the CPP.

Who are some of the people you can report potential CPP violations to during this activity?

DRAFT

Case Studies

These case studies are designed to encourage critical thinking. Each case study is based on a true story of incidents that have occurred at CAP activities. While not all of these stories are examples of hazing, many provide examples of inappropriate leadership behavior.

As you consider the situations presented by these case studies, it might be helpful to refer to the principles of hazing analysis presented in CAPP 52-23, *Cadet Protection Policy Implementation Guide*:

1. Normal authorized training rarely, if ever, amounts to hazing.
2. Not every mismatch between training intensity and subject matter amounts to hazing.
3. Leaders should assess how the questioned actions would affect a reasonable cadet of similar age, gender, and experience under the same or similar conditions.

By actively engaging in the analysis of these situations, leaders of cadets will be better equipped to identify and respond appropriately to similar situations they might encounter.

Motivation

General Eisenhower once said, **“The idea [of leadership] is to get people working together, not only because you tell them to do so and enforce your orders but because they instinctively want to do it for you.”**

The Bottom Line

The best leaders inspire their teams to get the job done by taking care of their followers while living the Core Values of Integrity, Respect, Excellence, and Volunteer Service.



If leaders embrace this attitude, the normal risks for hazing and other CPP violations will naturally decrease without lowering the expectations of a fun, challenging Cadet Program that encourages leadership development through overcoming personal and team-based challenges.