

CADET PROTECTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Intensity Levels of Military-Style Cadet Training

CAP PAMPHLET 52-23 February 2012



CADET PROTECTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Intensity Levels of Military-Style Cadet Training

CAP Pamphlet 52-23

February 2012 (corrected copy)

CAPP 52-23 describes the advantages of the Cadet Program’s military training, defines military intensity levels, and provides a suggested guide for commanders and Cadet Programs leaders to analyze difficult situations to determine the presence or absence of hazing.

PRINCIPAL AUTHOR & EDITOR

Lt Col **Ned Lee**, CAP, NCAC *Liaison*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1	Introduction: The Advantages of Military Training	1
Part 2	Military Intensity Levels: The Good & The Bad	2
Part 3	The Challenge	3
Part 4	Intensity Levels in the CAP Cadet Program	5
Part 5	Putting it Together: Setting the Appropriate Training Intensity	9
Part 6	When Intensity Over-Reaches: A Leader’s Guide to Hazing Analysis	12
Part 7	Protecting Against All Hazards	15
Part 8	A Final Word	18

Part 1 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.

Part 2 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.

Part 3 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.

Part 4 INTENSITY LEVELS IN THECAP 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.

Part 5 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.

Part 6 WHEN INTENSITY OVERREACHES: 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:

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

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.

- 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.

Part 7 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.

Part 8 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.