

CADET PROTECTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

CAP PAMPHLET 60-15
February 2018





National Headquarters Civil Air Patrol
CAPP 60-15
Cadet Protection Implementation Guide
February 2018

This document, CAPP 60-15, *Cadet Protection Implementation Guide*, amplifies the basic regulatory guidance found in CAPR 60-2, *Cadet Protection Policy* (CPP).

In this *CPP Implementation Guide*, Part I provides troubleshooting practices on how to choose the best course of action when strict, perfect compliance with the regulation is not possible. It is a collection of authorized remedies for when local leaders experience unforeseen challenges relating to the two-deep leadership policy, with practical tips on how to fulfill the CPP goal. Part II describes the advantages of the Cadet Program's military-style training, defines training intensity levels, and suggests best practices for commanders and Cadet Programs leaders to implement the military-style training model in a wholesome, age-appropriate manner.

Summary of Changes

This edition replaces CAPP 52-23, *Cadet Protection Implementation Guide*, February 2015. Cross-references have been updated, and apart from some minor rephrasings, there are no substantive changes.

Table of Contents

Part I. Best Practices for Implementing the Cadet Protection Policy's Adult Leader Standards

- Chapter 1 Key Concept: *In loco parentis*
- Chapter 2 Authorized Best Practices for Two-Deep Leadership Challenges
- Chapter 3 Authorized Best Practices for Overnight Cadet Activities
- Chapter 4 Authorized Best Practices for Adult Leaders' Supervisory Methods
- Chapter 5 Authorized Best Practices for Responding to Reasonable Suspicions of Abuse

Part II. Best Practices for Implementing Wholesome, Age-Appropriate Military-Style Cadet Training

- Chapter 6 Introduction: The Advantages of Military-Style Training
- Chapter 7 Military Intensity Levels: The Good and the Bad
- Chapter 8 The Challenge
- Chapter 9 Intensity Levels in the CAP Cadet Program
- Chapter 10 Putting It Together: Setting the Appropriate Training Intensity
- Chapter 11 When Intensity Over-Reaches: A Leader's Guide to Hazing Analysis
- Chapter 12 Protecting Against All Hazards
- Chapter 13 A Final Word

Part I. Best Practices for Implementing the CPP's Adult Leader Standards

Chapter 1 Key Concept: *In loco parentis*

Under the law, adult chaperones are required to act *in loco parentis* – in the place of the parent. Keep this principle in mind whenever you are making decisions about cadet protection.

For example, if your own child were seriously injured, you would call an ambulance. Every reasonable parent would. Therefore, when supervising another parent's child, the law expects you to demonstrate the same degree of care as if he or she were your own son or daughter.

Failing to intervene when you see a cadet being seriously harmed, or you if it looks like serious harm is likely to occur, is abusive because under the law it is as if you were neglecting your own child's well being. You'd be failing an important duty under the law.

In the CAP environment, it may be helpful to remember that the young people are not "your cadets" but are in fact someone else's children temporarily entrusted to your care. If you remember that principle and act always from that principle, you can't go wrong.

Chapter 2 Authorized Best Practices for Two-Deep Leadership Challenges

Here are some scenarios you might encounter where two-deep leadership becomes impossible from a practical perspective. As you read them, first ask yourself what most clear-minded, responsible parents would want you to do to honor the duty of *in loco parentis*.

2.1 Challenge: Your second senior cancels two days prior to the event.

Best Practice: Scramble and try to find a second senior, even if he or she is available for only a portion of the event. If that is not feasible, but you feel you can effectively supervise the activity on your own, ask your commander to waive the two deep norm this one time (but don't make a habit of asking).

2.2 Challenge: Your second senior cancels on five minutes' notice. You're already at the activity and cadets are starting to arrive.

Best Practice: Ask a parent to stick around. Even if that parent is not CPP trained and approved, he or she can interact with cadets in your presence, and you benefit by having a second adult on site. In the meantime, try to phone other seniors in your unit to ask them to come support the cadets. Failing that, try calling a parent. It may be reasonable for you to continue with the activity in a one-deep environment, but first consider the type of activity you're running. If the cadets are scheduled to do physically rigorous training, perhaps one deep leadership is irresponsible simply as a matter of physical safety, but perhaps you could do classroom activities instead. In the very least, if you find yourself unavoidably placed in a one-deep environment, be upfront about it with your commander as soon as possible for the sake of transparency.

2.3 Challenge: A cadet activity is underway and going well when your second senior is suddenly called away unexpectedly, creating a one-deep situation.

Best Practice: Consider how much time is remaining in the activity. If it is less than one hour, there is probably not much value in your calling other seniors and asking them to come in. If an hour or more is remaining on the activity schedule, try to phone another senior or a parent to help you support the cadets. Consider cutting the schedule short, although that may create problems on its own regarding cadets' transportation home. It is possible that the best option available is to continue the activity one-deep but be upfront about it with your commander so there is no appearance of impropriety.

2.4 Challenge: A cadet activity has ended. You and your second senior learn that the last remaining cadet's mom is suddenly unable to pick-up her cadet. The cadet lives near you, but nowhere near the second senior.

Best Practice: First, try calling the cadet's parents and get the facts as to their status, the practical options available, and their preferences on how to handle the unexpected situation. Logistical realities might indicate that the best remedy is for you to drive the cadet home alone. While not a desirable situation, this one-time modification is a reasonable solution if you and the parent agree and you're upfront about your actions with the second senior and your commander.

2.5 Summary. One-deep leadership is not intrinsically dangerous, but it is a situation CAP wants to limit as a precaution to the greatest extent possible. The real risk we are guarding against is the abuser who seeks repeated one-on-one contact with isolated youth.

Chapter 3 Authorized Best Practices for Overnight Cadet Activities

Whenever CAP is reasonably able to staff a co-ed overnight cadet activity with male and female adult leaders, it will try to do so. Having both genders available can only help an activity run smoothly. However, cadet activities may operate with just two seniors, regardless of gender.

Either way, the gender composition of the adult staff will be noted on the CAPF 60-80 permission slip so that parents can make an informed decision as to whether the supervision arrangements are a good match for the family and cadet.

3.1 Male & Female Cadets' Lodging Assignments

3.1.1 Minimum Requirements: Assign male and female cadets to separate quarters. Prohibit a senior member or cadet sponsor member from sharing a dorm room or tent with a cadet other than an immediate family member.

3.1.2 Best Practices:

3.1.2.1 *Male & Female Areas:* Make explicit the rules governing when males can be in female areas, and vice versa. Require cadets who are working together to do so in a public space, such as a day room, or to at least keep the door ajar while interacting.

3.1.2.2 *Lodging by Age:* Do what you reasonably can to assign cadets to roommates of similar age. In the least, try to avoid lodging the oldest cadets with the youngest cadets.

3.1.2.3 *Roommates.* Think carefully about rooming assignments. Don't put two troublesome cadets together. If the math puts one cadet in a room solo, pick a highly responsible cadet. Be mindful of which rooms have adjoining doors. For guidance on lodging transgender cadets, see CAPP 1-10, *Suggested Best Practices for Including Individuals with Special Needs*.

3.2 Adult Supervision After Hours. How are seniors to supervise cadets if they lodge separately? It may be a challenge to design the environment and allocate space for safety. You may need to think creatively (see 3-C below).

3.2.1 Preparation. The key to effective supervision in the overnight hours begins before the activity. Make your expectations about conduct clear to the cadets and use the activity as an incentive for responsible behavior. Only cadets with a track record of trustworthiness should be eligible for overnight activities.

3.2.2 Officer of the Day (O.D.). Assign a senior as duty officer, the designated adult to handle a "2 a.m. emergency." Brief cadets on who the "O.D." is and how to contact that person. To avoid one-on-one contact late at night, consider instructing cadets to waken their roommate / wingman and go together to seek the O.D.'s assistance for the 2 a.m. emergency.

3.3 Facility Layout

3.3.1 In a dormitory setting, it is helpful to locate males on one floor and females on another. But if males and females must share a floor, place males on one end, females on the other, and consider installing a makeshift partition in the hallway using bed sheets and clothesline.

3.3.2 In an open-bay barracks setting, assign a senior to the room located just off the open bay, if the barracks is designed such. Alternatively, assign a senior or two to the far end of the bay. While the senior would arguably be lodged in the "same room" as cadets, large, open bay barracks are not at all like small, confined dorm rooms.

3.3.3 In a campsite or bivouac setting, consider putting female cadets' tents on one side of the property, male cadets' tents on the opposite side, with seniors' tents in the middle.

3.3.4 In an aircraft hangar or similar large space, locate the female cadets in one corner of the space, the male cadets in an opposite corner, and the adults in the center or in another corner. In a school gym setting, consider having males sleep on the gym floor, with females on the stage, behind the stage curtain.

3.4 Hotel-Based Activities. Cadet activities taking place in hotel-like settings have a higher risk of encountering misconduct and safety issues than activities in self-contained barracks or dorm settings where cadet life is more regimented by nature. To minimize those risks, the project officer (or designee) for hotel-based events will fulfill the minimum requirements below and should follow the best practices below.

3.4.1 Minimum Requirements: (from CAPR 60-2)

Prior to cadet arrival, conduct a risk management analysis of the event, set ground rules, and identify off-limits areas. (Examples of factors meriting risk management analysis could include sight-seeing around town, interactions with the general public, access to fitness and pool areas, access to shopping and restaurant areas, etc.);

3.4.1.1 *Group Meeting.* Convene a group meeting of all cadets at the start of the day, during the day as necessary, and just prior to lights out;

3.4.1.2 *Restrict Movement.* Require cadets to move about the property in groups of three or more, when outside the main training area;

3.4.1.3 *Assign Adults.* Require cadets to be accompanied by at least two adult leaders when leaving the property (e.g. sightseeing, excursions for dinner);

3.4.1.4 *Cadet Lounge.* Designate a location, when reasonably feasible, where cadets can socialize, and;

3.4.1.5 *Post the Rules.* Make the above rules (2.5.5) available to cadets in writing (e.g., individual hard copies, or via email, or posted in a designated space).

3.4.2 Best Practices

3.4.2.1 *Hotel Services.* Have hotel management disable television pay per view and block long distance calls, web access, and room service. Ensure cadets do not have access to an in-room mini-bar. These precautions prevent cadets from accessing adult-only content and/or protect cadets from being charged steep service fees.

3.4.2.2 *Wingmen.* Make sure every cadet has a wingman for peer-to-peer support.

3.4.2.3 *Lodging Plan.* Working with hotel management, assign cadets to rooms located on a single, designated floor of the hotel, unless rooming with parents. Look at the hotel's floor plan diagrams and take note of which rooms have adjoining doors.

3.4.2.4 *Class Registration.* If the event includes numerous seminar choices (e.g. wing conferences), consider having the cadets register for each session. Take attendance and know where every cadet is at any given moment.

3.4.2.5 *Cadet Lounge.* Coordinate with hotel management to obtain a breakout room that cadets can use as a lounge. The cadets are going to get together and socialize, so you might as well provide them a safe space that you can control, versus finding males and females breaking off into the sleeping rooms.

Chapter 4 Authorized Best Practices for Adult Leaders' Supervisory Methods

Cadet activities require two-deep leadership, but how closely must seniors supervise cadets? What standard of supervision is even possible? Again, the principle of *in loco parentis* – what a clear-thinking, responsible parent would expect in a given situation – should be our guide. Described below are some common situations and best practices.

4.1 Proximity Supervision for Low-Impact, Short-Duration Classes

4.1.1 Situation: A flight of cadets wants to drill for twenty minutes in the parking lot adjacent to the unit headquarters, under the leadership of a cadet officer or cadet NCO.

4.1.2 Best Practice: For low-risk, short-duration activities like drill, calisthenics, and lectures, mere proximity supervision is reasonable. Constant, direct, line-of-sight supervision is not mandated. Again, *in loco parentis* provides the guidance. A responsible parent would allow cadet-aged youth to play basketball in the driveway while Mom's in the basement folding laundry, for example, so it is reasonable for CAP seniors to exercise mere proximity supervision in low-risk environments.

It is reasonable to allow cadets to drill or do light physical activity outdoors, without a senior physically present. However, if a senior or two is available to physically join the cadets, of course that is preferable. If only one senior is available, that still provides a reasonable degree of supervision because the senior would not be in a one-on-one situation, and a second senior is still present at the activity.

4.2 One-Deep Instruction in a Group Setting

4.2.1 Situation: One senior will be teaching a group of cadets.

4.2.2 Best Practice: Every cadet activity requires at least two seniors on-site, but it is reasonable for a single senior to work with a group of cadets, in a classroom or outdoor drill pad for example, while the second senior performs other functions in a separate room or area. Two-deep leadership is achieved because at least two adults are on-scene, and though a single senior is teaching cadets, there is no one-on-one contact because multiple cadets are present. However, if a second senior is available to sit-in as a colleague teaches a class, that extra bit of adult support can only help.

4.3 Close, Line of Sight Supervision for Critical, High-Impact Activities

4.3.1 Situation: A dozen cadets will be firing small arms at the rifle range, or hiking in dense fog where the visibility is 100 feet.

4.3.2 Best Practice: In high-impact activities, close, line of sight supervision by qualified adults is essential. No clear-thinking, responsible parent would tolerate CAP allowing a dozen teens to fire unfamiliar, lethal weapons unless three or four adults with specialized training remained within a few feet of the cadets, highly alert for the slightest deviation from their explicit, step-by-step instructions. Similarly, when hiking in dense fog, the group could easily become separated and get lost. A clear-thinking, responsible adult would instruct the cadets to stay on the trail, hike a bit slower than usual, halt at each trail junction, and remain within sight of the seniors.

4.4 Adult Supervision for Flight Activities. Cadet flight operations occur in a special environment due to aircraft load limitations, so the two-deep leadership standard is modified to some extent.

4.4.1 In the Cockpit

4.4.1.1 *On board the aircraft*, one senior (the pilot) is sufficient and one-on-one contact is permitted. However, place a cadet in the back seat if feasible. That practice provides a bit of extra protection for cadet and pilot alike, and allows cadets more time aloft.

4.4.1.2 *Gliders* fit only two souls on board, so obviously one-on-one contact is intrinsic to that environment.

4.4.1.3 *Formal flight instruction* with a CFI, and situations where the cadet is a CAPF 5-rated pilot are exempt from two-deep leadership standards. Still, we want to limit one-on-one contact to a bare minimum, so the suggested best practice is to conduct the mission briefing inside the airport terminal or in another public setting, go fly, and then debrief inside the terminal.

4.4.2 On the Ground

4.4.2.1 *Short Waits*. On the ground, when cadets are waiting 30 minutes or less for their turn to fly, one-deep senior supervision is permitted. Orientation flight waiting room scenarios do not arise more than once or twice a year, per cadet, on average, so we can tolerate lighter supervision.

4.4.2.2 *Day-Long Events*. The recommended best practice is to conduct orientation flights as a day-long event, with flights operating concurrent with some other cadet activity – let's say a color guard workshop. Have two seniors on the ground for managerial and supervisory purposes, and when it's time for a cadet to fly, pull that cadet(s) from the color guard activity, send them flying, then cycle through the next group one hour later.

Chapter 5 Authorized Best Practices for Responding to Reasonable Suspicions of Abuse

Please see CAPR 60-2 and carefully follow the procedures identified there to respond to suspicions of abuse. Some recommended best practices on how to communicate with members, parents, and media are discussed below.

5.1 Communicating With the Membership. From a practical perspective, the grapevine might begin to spread news of the “problem.” The commander must walk a fine line in this regard. On one hand, we want to halt the chatter because it is apt to spread half-truths and complicate an already difficult situation. On the other hand, abuse victims and people with first-hand information about an acute incident may be reluctant to come forward. An initial announcement along these lines is recommended:

We’re looking into an instance of potential misconduct. We will not discuss the details at this time. Please allow the process time to work. Do not discuss this matter with fellow CAP members – do not feed the grapevine or rumor mill, and please do not place any trust in what you hear from it.

However, if you have any specific information about potential misconduct, please come forward. If you’re a cadet, go see any adult you trust. Know that no one can punish you in any way for your honest efforts to get help for yourself or to protect fellow members’ safety.

5.2 Communicating With Parents. CAP’s policy is to provide factual information to parents as soon as practical following the development of a reasonable suspicion of abuse.

Having the unit commander contact the wing commander and CAP General Counsel helps enable CAP to meet its obligations to parents by providing senior leaders an opportunity to gather the facts, while simultaneously staying out of the way of a law enforcement investigation.

NHQ will provide to the wing and unit appropriate guidance on communicating with parents. Again, the initial announcement recommended at 5.1 above may be used if the local commander is directly approached by a parent seeking information.

5.3 Communicating With Media. Local CAP leaders will refer all media inquiries to NHQ. Respond to inquiries along these lines: *“Thank you for your inquiry. Please contact our national headquarters public affairs office for the most up-to-date, factual information. You can reach them at 877-227-9142, x250.”*

5.4 Obtaining Help for Victims & “Secondary Victims.” Typically the law enforcement agency puts victims in touch with special services. Additionally, there may be “secondary victims,” friends and colleagues who, though not directly harmed by an abuser, nevertheless feels the abuser’s effects. CAP will cooperate with authorities to steer those individuals toward the special services they need.

Part II. Best Practices for Implementing Age-Appropriate Military-Style Cadet Training

Chapter 6 Introduction: The Advantages of Military Training

In the two millennia or so since the first Roman centurion disciplined a recruit legionnaire, armies throughout the world have employed a military training model to train their soldiers.

Without exception, military training has included plentiful amounts of externally-imposed discipline and stress applied generously by noncommissioned officers (NCO). The traditional goal has been to create a cohesive group of obedient soldiers that could fight and win their nation's wars under life-threatening conditions.

The military training method has been remarkably consistent across both time and culture. An observer watching our imaginary Roman centurion training a cohort, Baron Friedrich von Stuben training General Washington's troops, or a modern Japanese Ground Self Defense Force NCO exercising his soldiers would instantly recognize and understand that military training was occurring, even if the language was unintelligible.

But military training has a more profound effect than simply producing effective armies and winning wars. Military training has molded countless highly successful civilian and business leaders.

It is telling that less than 10% of Americans are veterans, but over two thirds of our Presidents have had military experience. In the business world, military veterans are far more likely to serve as the CEO in an S&P 500 company than a non-veteran, and tend to serve longer and their companies tend to have stronger performances.¹

This should not be surprising, given the amount of training and discipline given to military members, who later apply their skills in civilian life. Some military "cross-over" skills critical to civilian success include:

- Learning how to work as part of a team
- Organizational skills, including planning and effective use of resources
- Communication skills
- Ability to receive, accept, and grow from valid criticism
- Defining a goal and motivating others to follow it
- Developing and employing a strong sense of ethics
- Ability to remain calm and effective under pressure.

The CAP Cadet Program has trained future leaders for America since its founding in 1942 by deliberately employing a challenging and vigorous military training model. Even the earliest CAP cadets wore military-style uniforms, engaged in military drill and ceremonies, and were required to use military customs and courtesies. Building on the skills developed in CAP, our cadets have gone on to serve in government, military, and business sectors with distinction.

¹ "Military Experience and CEOs: Is there a Link?," Korn/Ferry International, 2006.

Chapter 7 Military Intensity Levels: The Good & The Bad

Most dictionaries tell us that “intense” means “to a high level or degree.” In CAP, we use the term “military intensity” or simply “intensity” to describe the relative level of task focus provided by immediate supervisors in our Cadet Program.

To illustrate: We can see an extremely high military intensity level in training situations like “basic training” in the armed forces. One typically sees NCOs personally leading the trainees, and interacting directly with them to instill discipline and teach basic military skills like marching or cleaning a barracks. For military professionals, such situations may be characterized by loud voices giving commands, direct and public criticism of the trainees’ performance, and even things like “corrective” exercises. (“Drop and give me 20.”)

“Drop and give me 20!”

While such corrective physical training has a long and cherished history in the armed forces, CAP strictly prohibits such corrective physical training in our Cadet Program because of the differences in training objectives and outcomes as well as age, training, and maturity of our cadets when compared to members of the US armed forces.

In contrast, one sees relatively low military intensity levels during periods of academic instruction in the armed forces. One would not expect to see cadets at the Air Force Academy doing push-ups during Calculus class or shouting out responses in unison in a Laws of Land Warfare class. Cadets in class treat the instructor and each other with appropriate respect and courtesy, but the focus is on the academic subject at hand.

In general, higher levels of intensity are used during periods of instruction involving group physical skills and teamwork, like marching or during physical training or athletics, and lower intensity levels are used for traditional academic subjects focusing on individual skills and achievement such as history, math, and physics.

Problems can arise when there is a mismatch between the intensity level and the training to be accomplished. Too high an intensity level results in unnecessary stress and means the cadets cannot learn. In extreme cases, excessive intensity may amount to hazing, which is strictly prohibited in both the armed forces and CAP.

On the other hand, too low an intensity level may also result in missed learning opportunities or sub-optimal training results and deprive the cadets of the benefits of military instruction. It is hard to even imagine a Marine Corps Drill Instructor on the first day of Recruit Training sitting on the grass in the shade with a group of recruits quietly discussing how to stand at the position of attention.

The key is to match the appropriate level of military intensity to the particular training to be given, the trainee’s experience and ability, and the environment in which the training is occurring.

Chapter 8 The Challenge

The United States Air Force (USAF) has had over 60 years of experience in providing military training to young men and women. It is never an easy task, but the Air Force has achieved an enviable record in training average young women and men to produce leaders of character for our nation.

But because of the inherent differences between the USAF and CAP training environments, we cannot simply adopt their methods of training and intensity levels for our program for a variety of reasons:

- USAF Military Training Instructors (MTI; the USAF equivalent of a Drill Instructor) are successful mid-career NCOs who have taken an additional 7-14 weeks of intense academic and practical instruction at the MTI school and additional on-the-job (OJT) training with recruits at Lackland AFB. In contrast, most CAP officers responsible for overseeing our Cadet Program are not veterans, and often only have the benefit of a few weekends of training and perhaps some OJT. The CAP cadet officers and NCOs actually conducting the training have even less experience.
- USAF trainees are almost always young men and women 17-24 years of age, while most newer CAP cadets are in the 13-15 year age bracket. The differences in mental and emotional maturity between the two groups are enormous, and training methods that are best for adolescents in middle and high school are significantly different than the most successful methods for the older group.
- Our USAF partners have a wide variety of training environments. On the enlisted side, everyone starts with Basic Military Training (BMT) at Lackland, and then progress to a tech school in career fields as varied as security forces and dental technician. Officers start either in the Air Force Academy, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC), or Officer Training School (OTS). Each of these schools has its own unique blend of military and academic instruction, and the professionally-trained MTIs and other USAF trainers must constantly adjust the military intensity to produce successful airmen.
- CAP's training environments for our cadets are fewer in number, starting with regular squadron meetings and local activities. Most cadets will attend one or more wing encampments and some will attend the prestigious national cadet special activities (NCSA). Statistically, however, most of a typical cadet's time is spent at regular squadron meetings.

Just as young athletes benefit from encouragement and challenges to grow and achieve their potential, our future leaders need similar encouragement in our Cadet Program. But just like athletes, bad coaching and improper training of our cadets can result in discouraged cadets, lack of learning, and even emotional injuries.

For CAP leaders, the challenge is to find the right intensity level to challenge the cadets in a dynamic yet safe environment. Set the level too low, and the cadets will not thrive and grow in our challenging and vigorous program; set the level too high and the cadets may be overwhelmed and unable to learn.

National Headquarters has developed several training tools to help leaders determine and set the appropriate intensity levels during CAP cadet activities. For senior members, the topic is covered in the Training Leaders of Cadets (TLC) course and discussed during the mandatory Required Staff Training (RST; see CAPP 52-12, *Required Staff Training*) for activities lasting four or more nights. Cadets learn about setting appropriate intensity levels as they progress through the Learning to Lead curriculum. And, of course, the *CAP Cadet Protection Policy* in CAPR 52-10 clearly sets the outer boundary by defining the point at which excessive intensity becomes prohibited hazing.

In the real world, intensity (or “task focus”) in humans is difficult to measure directly. As yet, there is no way to rig up some sort of digital read-out and attach it to each cadet. Most behavioral scientists agree that we can imagine an “intensity continuum” ranging from sleep (with zero task focus) through a mid-point of intense concentration all the way through panic. Precisely because there are no precise measurements or guideposts, it is important for Cadet Programs leaders to be able to compare and discuss differing CAP training situations to help set and maintain the appropriate intensity levels.



For practical purposes, it is helpful to define intensity levels at CAP cadet activities into three levels. We can use this three-level model to help set the appropriate intensity for cadet activities.

Chapter 9 Intensity Levels in the CAP Cadet Program

Level 1 – Military Skills Instruction

During military skills instruction, intensity is relatively high. Training may be characterized by traditional externally-imposed discipline, and cadets may experience some stress as they attempt to meet individual and team standards in the areas of personal appearance, drill and ceremonies, customs and courtesies, etc.

In military skills training, we might occasionally expect to hear instructors using raised voices to provide guidance and training to the cadets. Instructors focus on cadets' performance measured against clearly defined and understood objective standards. Trainers may verbally criticize a cadet's objective performance, even if a cadet might feel slightly embarrassed.

It is important to remember that any criticism of cadets must be fair and appropriate to circumstances, with full consideration given to the receiving cadet's age, experience, and maturity level. Leaders must anticipate that any given group of cadets may contain a substantial difference in age and experience levels, and what may be appropriate and challenging for a 17 year-old high school senior with three encampments under her belt may be too much for a 13 year-old middle school student away from home for the first time.

EXAMPLE: “Cadet Jones, your ribbons are not centered on your pocket and you have hair protruding from under the front of your flight cap.” (Said in a quiet-to-moderate tone directly to a cadet during an inspection.)

Analysis: This is appropriate performance feedback on military skills. While it might be argued that public criticism may “embarrass” a cadet, any conscientious cadet should feel a small amount of chagrin or embarrassment for failing to do his best and meet basic standards.

EXAMPLE: “DON'T LOOK AROUND, CADETS! AT 'ATTENTION' YOUR EYES SHOULD BE LOOKING FORWARD, NOT AT THE OTHER FLIGHT!” (Said in a loud tone from a distance to a group of cadets.)

Analysis: This is an appropriate group criticism providing feedback on basic military skills and encourages cadets to meet the standards. Often leaders must speak loudly to be heard at a distance, particularly when addressing groups.

EXAMPLE: “THIS BARRACKS IS EMBARASSING! BECAUSE YOU DID NOT WORK AS A TEAM, WE FAILED THE INSPECTION!” (Said very loudly to a flight of cadets indoors.)

Analysis: This is most likely an appropriate combination of motivation, task focus, and behavioral feedback provided to a group. Note that it was delivered to the flight as a whole, and is designed to increase the cadets' desire to work as an effective team.

EXAMPLE: “OUTSTANDING! KEEP IT UP! GOOD JOB! (Said in a very loud tone to a group of cadets during a mile run.)

Analysis: It is always appropriate to encourage cadets to perform at their best. Often leaders must speak very loudly or even shout to be heard at a distance.

In encampment situations, cadets commonly receive intensive military skills instruction in subjects like dorm cleanliness, room displays and inspections, and physical training/athletics as part of the curriculum. Encampments differ from regular squadron meetings in several important respects such as length of the activity, the fact that the cadets normally reside at the encampment site, and the kinds of instruction received. Although there may be some similarities, encampment is not a “mini-BMT” (Basic Military Training), and our cadets should not be treated like AF trainees for the reasons discussed above. Military intensity levels may be relatively high during the first few days of encampment as the cadets learn and master some basic skills, but the intensity level normally declines after several days in response to the shift in the curriculum to more academic instruction and as the cadets’ performance improves.

“Going Hollywood”

Occasionally cadets may be “inspired” after watching movies like Full Metal Jacket, An Officer and a Gentleman, or The D.I., and attempt to emulate fictional drill instructors at CAP activities by screaming and shouting colorful epithets and demeaning comments. CP leaders should be alert to this risk, and immediately correct the situation by counseling the cadet. “The measure of leadership is not loudness.”

Level 1 intensity is commonly found during the early days of encampment, basic cadet schools, and during formations and drill and ceremonies instruction at local unit meetings. Physical Training formations and instruction, whether at encampment or local meetings, are often conducted at Level 1 intensity to provide task focus and promote esprit de corps.

Level 2 – Academic Instruction & Normal Duties

During academic instruction, intensity is lessened to facilitate classroom instruction. In academic situations, cadets are encouraged to interact with instructors in a respectful manner, but the focus is on learning the academic topic, not basic military skills.

Cadets may be called to attention at the beginning and end of classes, but would not normally be required to engage in military behaviors inappropriate in a normal classroom such as shouted responses, “sitting at attention,” etc. Level 2 intensity is the norm at advanced cadet training activities such as NCSAs, Region Cadet Leadership Schools (RCLS), etc.

During normal duties, cadets interact with senior members, civilians, and fellow cadets in a respectful and businesslike manner. The focus is performing the duty or work at hand. Normal duties include meetings, briefings and counseling sessions, review boards, emergency services work (including any field work), tours, interacting with the public, and the like.

Cadets continue to be held to a high standard in observing Air Force customs and courtesies at Level 2, including saluting, appropriate forms of address, and coming to attention when commanders or ranking officers enter a room. Level 2 intensity is also appropriate during CAP “business meetings” such as Cadet Advisory Council (CAC) meetings, Wing Conferences, and National Board meetings.

EXAMPLE: “CADET JONES, STAND AT ATTENTION AND SOUND OFF! WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF ‘RELATIVE WIND?’” (Said in a very loud tone during the local unit’s aerospace education class.)

Analysis: This is most likely an inappropriate use of Level 1 intensity techniques during an academic session that should normally be conducted at Level 2 intensity. Shouting out academic answers while at the position of attention may tend to interfere with the learning process by creating excessive stress and disruption both to the cadet called upon and the rest of the class.

EXAMPLE: Instructor: “Class, Good Morning!” (Cadets respond weakly with a subdued ‘good morning.’) “Not good enough, cadets. I CAN’T HEAR YOU! I SAID GOOD MORNING!” (Followed by a thunderous “GOOD MORNING!” response from the cadets.)

Analysis: Even though loud voices and group responses are not normally characteristic of a Level 2 environment, this is almost certainly an acceptable means to briefly gather and focus the attention of the cadets to the beginning of a block of instruction.

EXAMPLE: Instructor: “Cadet Jones! STAND AT ATTENTION! What are you doing back there?” (Said in a moderately loud tone during class to a cadet misbehaving in the back of the class.)

Analysis: This is most likely an appropriate use of Level 1 intensity directed briefly at an individual cadet to focus her attention on the academic instruction and to correct misbehavior.

EXAMPLE: Instructor: “Cadet Lindbergh, what are the three stages of a thunderstorm?” (Said in a moderate tone to a cadet in a full classroom.)

Analysis: Asking a direct question of an individual cadet to foster learning or an exchange of ideas is an appropriate use of Level 2 intensity. Allowing instructors or students to ridicule a cadet for incorrect answers would not be appropriate.

Level 3 – Social Interaction

During social interactions, intensity is lessened further to facilitate social interaction and training. Cadets are required to exhibit appropriate customs and courtesies and to display common courtesy and respect. Examples include unit picnics, banquets, award ceremonies, and cadet dances.

EXAMPLE: Cadet: “Hey, sir, looking good!” (Said to compliment the squadron commander’s appearance at a unit awards dinner.)

Analysis: It would normally be inappropriate for a cadet to comment on the appearance of a superior officer in a training or business environment. However, in a Level 3 situation such as a unit awards dinner, this can be appropriate.

EXAMPLE: Cadet Officer: “Sergeant, would you care to dance?” (Said to cadet NCO during a cadet ball.)

Analysis: This is likely an appropriate interaction during a Level 3 activity. Such fraternization would be inappropriate in a training or business environment.

EXAMPLE: “Table, ATTENTION!” (Said loudly by a cadet seated at a table with other cadets during the large wing awards banquet when a senior member passes close by the table.)

Analysis: This is most likely an inappropriate action by the cadet. It would be disruptive to the banquet for cadets to come to attention whenever a senior officer happened by an individual table.

Chapter 10 Putting It Together: Setting the Appropriate Training Intensity

CAP cadets come to our program for many reasons. Some have an abiding interest in aviation, some hope that CAP will help them become better leaders, and some simply have friends in the program. But all soon come to understand that the CAP Cadet Program uses leadership training methods successfully developed by the USAF. Cadets join a local unit and within weeks have begun to learn the basics of followership and some basic military skills like drill and ceremonies and wearing a uniform correctly. Indeed, it is the military aspect of our program that separates us from other outstanding youth programs such as Scouts or Camp Fire.

A reasoned selection

Leaders should specifically consider and set an appropriate intensity level during the activity planning process.

Cadet Programs leaders at all levels have the responsibility to set the intensity level of every activity in order to ensure that the cadets receive the best possible training. Leaders should specifically consider and set the appropriate intensity level during the planning process for the activity, and work with the cadet staff to ensure they understand and implement the intensity level appropriately. Good leaders also attend the scheduled staff training to make sure that the planned intensity level is implemented as directed, and make adjustments if necessary. Leaders should also be mindful that intensity levels will undoubtedly vary during the activity, and should provide guidance as to when and how the levels will change.

“The Intensity Toolbox”

Cadet Programs leaders have a number of tools and techniques to help set intensity levels for an activity. Activity plans, orders, and training schedules may describe the commander’s desired intensity level for all or a portion of the activity.

Specific “tools” that may raise or lower intensity levels to the desired level include:

- **Leader Voice Tone:** Moderate-to-loud voice tone used by a leader may elevate or sustain a high intensity level; a normal-to-soft voice tone can be used to lower or sustain a lower intensity level.

- **Feedback/Correction Provided by Leader:** Feedback provided to cadets that is immediate and provided in front of other cadets can be used to elevate or sustain a higher intensity level; individual feedback provided at a later time can be used to lower the intensity level.

EXAMPLE: (During an inspection) “Cadet Jones, your shoes are unshined and scuffed. Did you ask for help from your element leader?”

EXAMPLE: (During an inspection) “Cadet Jones, see me during the break to talk about your shoes.”

- **Formality of Feedback/Correction Provided by Leader:** Formal feedback is characteristic of a higher intensity level; informal feedback is usually found at a lower intensity level.

EXAMPLE: “Cadet Jones, you drilled your flight out of bounds during the drill competition. Do you have an explanation?”

EXAMPLE: “David, I’m a little concerned about what happened at the drill comp. What’s going on?”

- ***Clothing:*** Activities conducted in uniform – particularly BDUs – will normally have higher intensity levels than activities conducted in civilian clothes.
- ***Posture of Cadet During Activity or While Receiving Feedback:*** Putting cadets into military formation or at the individual position of attention can raise or sustain a high intensity level; cadets who are seated or relaxed are normally at a lower intensity level.
- ***Time Standards:*** Shortening the time to accomplish a given task (making a bed, cleaning the latrine, etc.) will tend to elevate or sustain a high intensity level; lengthening the time to accomplish a given task may tend to lower the intensity level.
- ***Accuracy Standards:*** Raising or tightening the standards of performance will tend to elevate or sustain a high intensity level. Reducing or loosening the standards for a particular group or individual task may tend to lower the intensity level.

It is normally fairly easy to lower an intensity level that is too high for the current training. Simply giving the cadets a break (“take 10 and meet me back here”), or allowing them to eat or drink something will normally lower the intensity level immediately. It could be as simple as putting the cadets into a group to discuss an aerospace current event for a few minutes.

A final consideration: our cadet leadership training takes place in the context of a “leadership laboratory.” For our cadets, leadership is not a dry academic subject studied from ancient textbooks, but a full-on participatory experience in which cadets are immersed upon taking the Cadet Oath. Cadets are expected to lead and follow routinely; whether it is at the regular squadron meeting, a wing summer encampment, or at a National Cadet Special Activity. A fully functional cadet chain of command at all cadet activities is a hallmark of our program.

But with every chance of leadership success comes a chance for leadership failure. Just as every toddler falls occasionally while learning to walk, we expect the occasional stumble by cadets as they mature into leaders. Within our leadership laboratory, our cadets can make mistakes and fail – yet more importantly, learn from their errors safely.

Inexperienced cadet leaders on occasion may try to set an inappropriate military intensity level for a given class or block of instruction. They may allow a class to be too lax; or perhaps they will be overly strict. Good mentors may allow the situation to continue for a while to allow the cadet leader to learn from the experience, then provide guidance on how to better set the intensity level next time. This might mean that some cadets were required to stand at attention in formation for longer than was otherwise necessary; or the cadet leader may have been inappropriately harsh in his criticism. That is part of the learning experience for the students, as well. Not every mismatch between the training to be conducted and the proper military intensity level amounts to hazing.

Of course, senior member supervisors are always present at cadet activities, and stand ready to intervene if a cadet leader’s poor leadership begins to amount to prohibited hazing.

Chapter 11 When Intensity Over-Reaches: A Leader's Guide to Hazing Analysis

All Cadet Programs leaders have a responsibility to safeguard and protect cadets from harm. Under CAP regulations, commanders at all levels and officers acting in positions such as Activity Directors have additional responsibilities to take certain actions when physical abuse or hazing is suspected.

In CAPR 52-10, *CAP Cadet Protection Policy*, CAP adopted the official Department of Defense definition of 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."² The DoD provides examples of prohibited hazing such as "blood pinning," hitting or striking trainees, and forced head shaving. The DoD also makes it clear that regular authorized training and even additional military instruction for individuals who need it are not hazing.

Experienced Cadet Programs leaders will easily be able to determine whether a given situation amounts to hazing in the great majority of circumstances. Examples of hazing would include making racial or gender-based comments, forcing cadets to do push-ups, or slapping cadets for simple uniform violations. Every responsible Cadet Programs leader seeing such a situation today would immediately take corrective action to safeguard cadets, and then follow the procedures outlined in CAPR 52-10, *CAP Cadet Protection Policy*.

But even experienced Cadet Programs leaders may come across situations when it is not immediately clear whether hazing has occurred. Occasionally this may occur at cadet activities with high levels of military intensity. When analyzing a questionable situation, Cadet Programs leaders should be guided by the following principles:

Principles of Hazing Analysis:

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.

After considering the principles above, consider the following factors concerning the training environment, the members involved, and the specific actions in question in order to reach a conclusion:

The Training Environment and Intensity Level

- What was the nature of the activity? Was it an activity focusing on military skills such as an encampment or drill and ceremonies school?

Such activities are designed to sustain an overall higher intensity level than a typical squadron meeting. While squadron meetings may use Level 1 intensity for formations and PT, normally the majority of squadron time is spent at Level 2 or Level 3 intensity.

- Did this take place on a military facility or a civilian establishment?

There is a distinct difference between a barracks and a unit meeting space such as a community center or church basement.

² Memorandum of the Secretary of Defense, Hazing, 30 OCT 97

- Was the training academic in nature or focused on basic military skills?

Typically, higher intensity levels are normal during basic military skills instruction.

- Was there a high ambient noise level such as on a flight line?

Vocal directions and instructions may have to be shouted in a noisy environment to be heard. However, shouting the same directions and instructions in a quiet classroom would be inappropriate and may be abusive or demeaning.

The Members Involved

- Was this between a senior member and cadet(s), or between cadets?

Senior members are held to higher standards of conduct than cadet officers and NCOs who are still learning to lead.

- Was there a substantial difference in grade?

A cadet airman may be more easily intimidated and subject to abusive behavior from a cadet officer than from a peer.

- Did the members differ significantly in size, age, etc?

12- and 13-year-old cadets may be more easily intimidated and subject to abusive behavior by older and/or physically larger cadets.

- Was the cadet unusually susceptible?

Was the cadet ill, sleep deprived, suffering from a diagnosed mental disability, experiencing a recent loss in the family, etc.? Did the other party know of it?

The Specific Actions in Question

- Was there inappropriate shouting or yelling?

Raised voices that are not reasonably related to being heard by the recipient or used briefly to focus or motivate a cadet's actions may be a factor suggesting abuse.

- Was there inappropriate language used?

Offensive, vulgar, or demeaning language is never appropriate and may rise to the level of prohibited abuse.

- How close together were the members?

Members standing extremely close together (e.g. a violation of the cadet's "personal space") may tend to show that the questionable conduct may be more serious than the same words said from a longer distance.

- Did a member touch another member? Was it deliberate? What was the nature of the touching?

Inadvertent touching will rarely amount to hazing. Similarly, consensual touching to correct a salute or a uniform violation is unlikely to be problematic. Unconsented touching – or any deliberate touching of private areas such as buttocks, groin, or female chest – may suggest an abusive or demeaning situation.

Remember, the hazing principles and factors are not intended for use in hazing situations where the violation is already clear. Every CAP member must take the immediate actions described in CAPR 52-10 when confronted with plain violations of the Cadet Protection Policy, including situations like an officer screaming in a cadet's ear, subjecting a cadet to sexual degradation, or deliberately striking or assaulting a cadet.

Chapter 12 Protecting Against All Hazards

Sometimes when we concentrate on protecting our cadets from improper training, we may overlook other serious dangers to our cadets. The following case studies help illustrate the importance of our duty to protect our cadets from harm.

Case Study #1

The Anytown Cadet Squadron was a small and struggling unit with just three seniors and about a dozen cadets, but had a reputation of producing high-quality cadets that did well at encampment and other wing activities. All three senior members were in their late 20s and were former cadets. They had also become good friends while working together at the unit. Two of senior members were recently married and just starting their careers. The third senior member was an active-duty USAF SSgt stationed at a nearby Air Force base. All three senior members set good examples at the meetings and were admired by the cadets.

The weekly meetings were usually of high quality, but the senior members found it hard to arrange adequate supervision for weekend activities such as bivouacs or “uniform runs” to the military clothing sales store on base. The newly-married senior members often had conflicting work or family responsibilities and came to rely more and more on the AF SSgt, who often was the only senior member available for the weekend activities, including several overnight activities involving camping out in local parks and recreation areas.

After a parent complained, it was learned that the USAF SSgt had sexually abused a cadet during one or more of the overnight activities. The senior member was criminally prosecuted and imprisoned for the crime.

What Went Wrong?

A lot of things. Beyond the obvious violation of the “two-deep” senior member supervision requirement found in CAPR 52-10 for overnight activities, the more fundamental failure of the other two senior members was to never even consider the possibility that their friend would exploit his CAP position to sexually abuse cadets. In their minds, it was literally inconceivable that a senior member who had passed the required FBI screening, taken the required Cadet Protection Training, and was a serving USAF NCO could possibly be a threat to a cadet. This “blind spot” made it that much easier for them to “wink” at violating the regulation and allowing a single senior member to supervise an overnight activity.

Lessons Learned

Lessons learned: Sexual predators do not look like the stereotypical “dirty old man in a trench coat.” Experts tell us that predators are usually friendly, engaging, and likeable people who are known to the victim, and who deliberately seek out opportunities to be alone with their intended victims. CAP leaders must be aware of this risk and use Operational Risk Management (ORM) to structure their activities to minimize opportunities for improper sexual activity.

Case Study #2

Columbia Wing supported a large regional air show and used it as one of their major cadet activities, drawing over 200 cadets annually. The cadets guarded the static displays at night and provided safety information to the thousands of visitors to the air show during the day. The cadet staff consisted of highly experienced cadets drawn from throughout the wing supervised by over a dozen qualified senior members. Last year, the 18-year-old cadet commander was a tireless supervisor, conducting staff meetings late into the night, and often personally checking on the welfare of the

cadets during the early-morning hours. At the conclusion of the air show, the cadets had safely accomplished their mission with distinction and were thanked by the grateful air show organizers. The cadet commander signed out of the activity, climbed into a car, and began to drive home, a distance of about 100 miles. The cadet commander never arrived.

Later it was learned that the cadet was killed in a solo vehicle accident when the car left the roadway and struck an object. The Highway Patrol determined that the cadet had apparently fallen asleep behind the wheel.

What Went Wrong?

Despite watching the cadet commander work very long hours, no one recognized that the cadet commander was dangerously sleep-deprived and should not have been permitted to drive until adequately rested.

Lessons Learned

Sleep deprivation can be deadly. CAP leaders must be aware of this risk and use Operational Risk Management (ORM) to structure their activities to ensure adequate rest for all members. Commanders/Activity Directors must be vigilant and actively monitor their personnel to make certain that drivers and pilots, in particular, get sufficient sleep.

Case Study #3

Anywing was proud of their annual wing conference. Over 100 members attended in a typical year, including dozens of cadets attracted by “cadet-friendly” activities such as model rocketry launches and DDR presentations. The main conference hotel was the Marriott, where the seminars were conducted and almost all of the senior members stayed. Most cadets, however, chose to stay at the adjacent Discount 6 Motel where the rooms were considerably cheaper and the management didn’t seem to mind how many cadets could be crammed into a room, as long as the bill was paid.

Two years ago, the Big City Composite Squadron sent 7 cadets, supervised by two senior members, to the wing conference. The senior members checked the cadets into a room at the Discount 6 Motel, and then walked to the Marriott and checked into their own room, agreeing to meet for breakfast the next morning. The cadets were forbidden to leave the Discount 6 Motel grounds, but were allowed to swim in the motel pool.

In the meantime, the wing Cadet Advisory Council vice-chair, C/Maj Jones, a 19 year-old college student, also checked into the Discount 6 Motel. At some point during the evening, C/Maj Jones met one of the 14 year-old cadets from the Big City Squadron at the pool, and invited the cadet to his room. After C/Maj Jones provided alcohol to the cadet, the cadet was sexually abused.

What Went Wrong?

Inadequate supervision by senior members. At overnight activities, senior members must be close enough to prevent misbehavior and to protect cadets against abuse. Here, the cadets were essentially unsupervised in a motel overnight.

Lessons Learned

Even a cursory ORM process would have identified the multiple serious risks inherent in putting 7 cadets into a motel room without effective supervision by the required two senior members. In conference situations, senior members must actively supervise cadets using methods appropriate to the cadets’ age, maturity, and experience in the program. Every cadet should have a specific senior member responsible for his supervision for the duration of the conference.

Chapter 13 A Final Word

CAP leaders at all levels of our organization selflessly volunteer hundreds of thousands of hours every year supporting our successful Cadet Program. Each of us wants to do “the right thing” and conduct a quality Cadet Program that produces outstanding leaders for America. Our Cadet Program was designed as a vigorous and challenging program that puts significant demands on our cadets as they progress and promote.

CAP regulations clearly prohibit military intensity so excessive that it amounts to hazing. CAP cadets may be traumatized, demeaned, and humiliated when Cadet Programs leaders fail to act to prevent such abuse. Each hazing incident has a negative effect on the individuals involved, and on CAP as a whole. But it is also possible to “over-react” to the possibility of hazing and fail to appropriately challenge our cadets to learn and succeed in our program.

The challenge is to correctly match the military intensity level to the training and cadets at hand. Too high a level may result in cadets unable to focus on improving their individual and group skills. Too low a level may result in unmotivated cadets who fail to focus on their training and “sleep-walk” through the program, thus failing to achieve their potential.

It is impossible to anticipate every possible situation and prescribe the specific remedy to ensure our cadets are challenged, yet safe. That is precisely why we have developed a corps of experienced Cadet Programs leaders, and require that they attend and supervise every cadet activity. Each Cadet Programs leader brings a wealth of experience, maturity, and – most importantly – plain common sense and wisdom to the job.

We have attempted to provide some background information and tools for CP leaders to approach some difficult issues and reach the appropriate conclusions.

Please send comments and suggestions for improvement of this pamphlet to NHQ CAP/CP.