STAT

Scenario Training for Agile Teams



Introduction

Problem: Effective teams traditionally develop through shared experiences as members interact over time. Transition Teams are faced with the unique challenge of having to become an effective team within a short time frame.

Purpose: The Scenario Training for Agile Teams (STAT) process provides the ability to rapidly establish an effective team through the discussion of scenarios. These discussions help team members gain insight regarding one another that normally is gained through real-world interactions. Supplementing real-world experiences with the STAT process allows for effective teams to be established in less time.



When and Where

STAT is a flexible, informal, team training process. It can:

- Occur at various points during the day (e.g. chow, PT, training downtime, etc.)
- Last for only a few minutes or longer
- Be used with the pre-defined scenarios, or those generated by team members
- Be conducted in one-on-one or team discussions
- Be initiated by any team member

Scenario Generation

Determine the team training objective:

- Shared Understanding
- Trust

Identify scenario(s) to support the training objective:

- Choose a pre-defined scenario (refer to the "scenarios" section)
- Generate your own scenario

Scenario Discussion

Use the scenarios to guide discussion towards your training objective.

Details on how to focus these conversations towards the separate training objectives are provided in each section.

Overview

Develop Shared Understanding

Shared Understanding exists when members in a team have a common understanding of:

- What the task is
- What the goals and subgoals are
- Strategies for reaching the team's goals
- Each team member's strengths and weaknesses
- Values and preferences of the team and team members
- Roles each team member will serve
- The commander's leader intent

Benefits of Shared Understanding: Teams with shared understanding are shown to have better coordination and less conflict than teams without. When team members are on the same page, they are able to predict one another's behaviors and act quickly in the face of changing circumstances. Leaders are also able to give their team members more responsibility, increasing the team's agility.

Transition Teams have members coming from different units and MOSs. This results in members *not* having a common understanding of how to conduct business. Through the STAT process, team members can identify where differences exist and come to a common understanding more rapidly.

STAT Process for Shared Understanding



Scenario Generation

Choose one or two scenarios to discuss with your team (refer to the "scenarios" section).



Scenario Discussion

- Present the scenario's situation, describing the scenario up to the point an action would be taken.
 - "Here's the situation..."
- 2 Have team members share their insights and responses to the situation with prompts, such as:
 - "What is important about the task at hand, and why?"
 - "What team and / or mission goals need to be considered, and why?"
 - "What strategies should be considered for reaching these goals, and why?"
 - "Which team members should be responsible for what, and why?"
 - "What are the Team Chief's preferences?
 - "What does the Team Chief value, and why?"

Note: Make sure to share what you would do given the scenario, and why.

Compare and contrast team members' actions.

3 Consider using scenario spins ("What if..."), offering opportunities for team members to respond to extensions of the scenario where a common understanding is necessary.

Shared Understanding

Develop Trust

Trust is an expectation that a person has a high level of integrity and is highly dependable. It is a willingness to put oneself at *risk* because of confidence that the other person will do what is expected.

Trust is initially determined by surface level factors, such as rank and combat patches, that can lead to assumptions about a person's prior experiences and / or qualifications. These assumptions can incorrectly influence trust as they may not be accurate. However, direct "experiences" with one another over time allows team members to develop a more informed, deeper level of trust.

Transition teams typically do not have this much time. **STAT** offers a process for coming to deeper levels of trust more *quickly* by discussing prior experiences through scenarios.

STAT-assisted development of trust in Transition Teams is important because:

- Team members have different background/experiences
- Team members must quickly work as one team
- Team members have little past experience/exposure to one another

STAT Process for Trust



Scenario Generation

Choose one or two scenarios to discuss with your team (refer to the "scenarios" section).



Scenario Discussion

- Present the scenario's situation, describing the scenario up to the point an action would be taken.
 - "Here's the situation..."
- Have team members share prior experiences to similar situations with prompts, such as:
 - "Have you ever been in a similar situation?
 - If yes, "What did you do, and why?"
 - If no, "What would your military experience tell you to do, and why?"
 - What help would you expect from your team members in a situation like this, and why?
 - What do you envision the role of other team members being, and why?

Note: Make sure to share **your prior experiences** to similar situations, and the <u>why</u> of your actions.

Compare and contrast team members' actions.

Consider using scenario spins ("What if..."), offering opportunities for team members to change their responses to learn more about one another over a range of experiences to develop a stronger sense of trust Trust

The following scenarios were reported by Transition Team members upon returning from deployment. Select a scenario to build Shared Understanding or Trust. You can also develop your own scenario.

1

Medical Emergency

On a host nation FOB, a host nation 1LT was eating at the brigade DFAC with his superior officer (CPT) after returning from a patrol. The 1LT began to complain about shortness of breath and being light headed. After requesting a drink to ease his symptoms, the officer's condition quickly became worse to the point in which he collapsed. Less than 60 feet from the DFAC were Battalion medics that had been personally trained by the transition team Medical Advisor for the last six months on such situations. The senior host nation officer at the table did not request help from the battalion medics because his cultural norm is that only medics of appropriate rank and authority would be allowed to treat the Brigade officer. Instead, the senior host nation officer sent for the Brigade medic, who was located 500 meters from the DFAC. The problem is that the Brigade medic is not always at the Brigade Aid Station during that time of the evening. Several minutes went by and the 1LT officer began to turn blue in the face from a lack of oxygen, and his condition continued to diminish quickly. As an American part of the transition team, you witness this situation

Ineffective Leadership

You are a member of a transition team stationed at the Phoenix Academy in Kuwait. Your team is currently undergoing its advanced training. The team chief's relationship with members of the team did not get off to a very good start, as the team chief was unreasonably demanding at times and also talked down to the other members of the team. The relationship worsened after only two out of ten members showed up to a language class that was made optional. After the poor showing, the team chief called the group together and started to dress down his CPTs and NCOs by yelling and cursing at them. The incident led to members of the team requesting to leave the team, and some Soldiers' emotions were highly charged as they viewed the team chief as disrespectful. You believe the leader's behavior is destroying the team and something must be done soon to ensure the team can work well together to fulfill the mission

Misinterpretation

You are a Major serving as the transition team advisor and have a host nation LTC counterpart. You have been assigned a US-hired DOD contract civilian to act as your interpreter. You have noticed that the interpreter has become very comfortable with the host nation BDE leadership. During the course of a meeting between you and your counterpart, the interpreter begins holding independent conversations with the LTC, as well as answering questions posed to you by the LTC without your input. At first, you let the interaction continue. However when it becomes obvious that the interpreter is attempting to answer questions without your input, you stop the conversation and take the interpreter privately aside to ask him what he had been talking about and why he had not been translating the conversation. The interpreter stated that he knew the answers to the questions and that he thought it was easier for him to just answer rather than translating them. Furthermore, the team chief has allowed this interpreter to perform in this manner on several previous occasions.

Stealing Resources

During the summer with days averaging 120 degree heat, the ten-man advisor team would supply their host nation BDE with potable ice daily. Each day, the Transition Team would supply the ice in a cooler which was managed by the US Team SGM. However, due to shortages in the amount of ice any member could receive, the Transition Team had to enforce rationing to ensure equal distribution to their host nation unit. Over time, the team SGM decided to trust certain host nation leaders to come and pick up their share of ice for their units unsupervised. One day when the SGM was not in view, one of the host nation leaders was pulling away with his 20 bags of ice. As you stop him to verify the number of bags, you notice he had double what he should have. When you asked why he grabbed double the amount he should have, he replied he had thought he was supposed to have that many bags.

Missing Equipment

You are the commulcations advisor on a BN Transition Team. You task your commo counterpart to get a report to you about 2 radios that were assigned to your counterparts but were missing. You learned early on that the Iraqi officers treat enlisted Soldiers differently than we do. The radios were lost by officers, but they tried turning it around to say that they gave them back to the Soldiers. The Soldiers were scared because they might have to pay for the radios, even though they knew the 2 officers lost them. The Soldiers come to you and ask your help in getting two more radios to replace those that were "lost".

Alleged Bribery

Your transition team is in the host nation advising their Division G2. The division is a new unit which was in force generation mode and is responsible for several recruiting drives to recruit potential Soldier candidates. During one of the recruiting drives, the division G2 had been rumored to be taking part in accepting bribes valued at approximately \$300 in order to allow recruits' paperwork to be given top priority. No direct evidence was ever presented to confirm or deny the G2's involvement, but the rumors persisted.

Conflict of Interest

You are at the host nation's BDE HQ in the BDE CDR's office stationed at Taji, Iraq. Following repeated periods of fighting al-Qaida in the villages, the host nation BDE CDR has planned a meeting with the local hostile Sheiks. The purpose of the meeting was to try to gain cooperation of the Sheiks in defeating the al-Qaida in the area. However, one of the Sheiks was a confirmed murderer of a Sunni man in a shooting 3-5 days prior to the meeting and was also a known al-Qaida cooperator. This Sheik was being sought for detainment by the IP and US forces. The meeting is planned to take place regardless.

Training Incident

Your transition team is supervising drills at a military training center in the host nation. The drill instructor is a host nation Soldier with a 1SG rank. While you are supervising, you witness the 1SG disciplining a private at a live fire range by striking him with his pistol belt. After multiple strikes, the private lay at the 1SG's feet motionless.

Authority and Status

You are part of a transition team, and have developed a very strong relationship with the host nation BN CDR by meeting informally nearly every day. During a briefing one morning, the CDR thanked you for all your help and told you that he disliked your team chief, MAJ X. He said that it wasn't personal. Rather, MAJ X had made many promises for materials, supplies and training which haven't materialized. Your counterpart went on to explain that he isn't the only host nation Officer who feels this way, and that because of your honest dealings, many of the host nationals view you as the senior transition team advisor. The briefing ends and you leave for your next meeting. You feel that something needs to be done about this perception among the host nationals.

Lost Weapon

You are working as an advisor to a host nation company conducting patrols and operations out of a city in the host nation. A little earlier that week, there was a car accident involving one of the squad's you are overseeing. Specifically, during a combined operation north of the city, while crossing a canal using an engineer (military) bridge, a BMP fell off the bridge and landed upside down in a canal killing the driver inside. The rest of the squad survived, as they had exited the BMP prior to the crossing, leaving only the driver. Later, one of the host nation Soldiers reported leaving his weapon inside the vehicle. The host nation LT commanding this squad requested your assistance in recovering the weapon. You explain that your transition team would not support a very dangerous recovery operation for such a low value item. You go on to explain that the probability of success is low and risk to all involved definitely outweighed reward. Upon returning to base, and hearing that a Soldier had lost his weapon. the Soldier who was responsible for the weapon was jailed indefinitely by the acting host nation BDE CDR. The host nation LT in charge felt a great deal of sympathy for the jailed Soldier, and seems to be very bitter about your unwillingness to help.

Personnel Problems

You are serving as an interpreter manager for a BN in the host nation, and you are currently having a problem with one of your interpreters. He is a local, civilian hire (category I interpreter), and he has worked for the US Army for more than two years. Specifically, you are trying to get him to sign his time sheet. He had returned from vacation four days late, and you deducted the days from the interpreter's pay. At first, the interpreter is upset that his paycheck will be garnished. Pleading his case, the interpreter insists that in his last unit, he had never been charged for excess leave. After a few moments, the interpreter became calm, and friendlier about the issue. He says, "We are supposed to be brothers, and we must help each other. Isn't there some way you could help me here?"

Respect in a Transition Team

As a counterpart to your transition team, a host nation LTC was surprised to learn that a SSG would be mentoring him rather than a MAJ or MSG. In order to demonstrate his authority and status, the LTC consistently lied and defied appointments and the training schedule. He tried to use the US SSG only to arrange S-4 functions. The LTC did not know he was dealing with a SSG who was a drill sergeant, Iraqi vet and had learned the language of his counter-part.

After the LTC decided to completely miss an initial clothing issue appointment for his 1,500 soldiers that had been set up by the SSG, he was confronted by the angry SSG. The SSG shamed the LTC publicly in the LTC's native lanuage. After this incident, the SSG decided to never speak to the LTC again until he changed his ways. During the next week, the SSG purposely turned his back to the LTC whenever he requested something.

Losing Mission Focus

You are the team leader on your transition team that suffers from lack of cohesion and appears to have lost sight of mission goals. The S-3 and S-2 could not get along. They would not exchange information and often left other team members out of the loop. The S-2 was unable to make a decision; the S-3 was arrogant and unwilling to take any advice. To make matters worse, it seemed that the team as a whole was more concerned with being friends with the Iraqis than carrying out proper orders and mission activities. In short, members of the team stopped caring and became unproductive NCOs and officers.

Manpower Shortage

The Iraqi BDE just deployed to their area of operation from Kirkuk (KI) where their new force had been generated. The Iraqi unit was composed of 99% Shia deployed in a Sunni majority AO. The IA BDE was newly minted and had very little individual training and collective training. The IA BDE was composed of 4 Iraqi infantry battalions manned with only 10% officers and less than 15% NCOs. The Iraqi Soldiers were untrained. inexperienced, and felt very uneasy about their situation. The Coalition Force (CF) Advisor and the IA CDR planned a combined operation where they were to conduct a cordon and search mission. The transition team trained the Iraqi platoon on cordon and search tips for two weeks. Due to the inexperience of the IA, it was agreed that the CF will take the lead in the operation particularly in house clearing. Once at the objective, the CF Soldiers assigned the IA Soldiers to take the lead in clearing the house instead of being in support and learning by observation. The Iragi Soldiers momentarily paused at the door and were very hesitant entering the house to clear it.

Sharing Resources

You are advising your host nation counterpart (1LT) on allowing another host nation's medical unit to utilize the medical clinic. However, your counterpart is resistant to the idea of another unit utilizing resources and equipment from his unit. Using the interpreter, you explained to your counterpart the need to support one another. The Soldier became very defensive and said he would quit the Army before working with the other unit. The Soldier's chain of command was no different on the matter.

Unprofessional Behavior

You are a transition team advisor assigned one interpreter, and your mission is to escort a host nation NCO, his 16 Soldiers and 3 HMMWVs from the airfield. After a short briefing, you tell the NCO to have his Soldiers mount up and move out. Your group is en route and things appear to be going relatively smoothly. However, along the way, the host nation vehicles come to a stop next to a plane parked on the runway and proceed to jump out of their vehicles and pose next to the plane for pictures. You look toward the NCO, who seems to be fine with this. You are on a tight schedule and do not have time for this type of behavior.

Outcomes of Disrespect

You are a member of a British controlled ETT stationed in the host nation. Your team consists of 2 American NCOs and 4 British NCOs, one of which is a SGM (the highest ranking NCO in this ETT). Your mission is to mentor the host nation NCOs in order to effectively conduct an NCO school similar to your NCO background training. After a while, you come to notice a problem with the British SGM. Specifically, he has no respect for the host nation people and acts as though he is running the course and not simply advising the host nation instructors. This behavior continues for a few days when finally the host nationals have had enough and walk out of the course, refusing to do anymore training until the SGM leaves the course or apologizes for his behavior.

Disrespecting Lower Ranks

You are working as a transition team advisor to the host nation's command staff in the host nation. You have been given the assignment of mentoring a host nation LTC on how to properly conduct the day to day operations of this office. The host nation LTC was incensed when he learned that his advisor was at a lower rank than his own. Rather than attend his tutoring session, this host nation LTC would lie about having conflicting taskings, or he would consistently defy appointments and the training schedule to demonstrate his "authority and status". You have several impending deadlines that demand your cooperation with this host nation LTC.

Group Division

You are the non-commissioned officer in charge (NCOIC) for the transition team. A month into your assignment, the team started to divide into noticeable cliques. Team members were becoming more aggressive and antisocial to one another for a variety of different reasons including simply being stationed in Diyaua Province in Iraq, living in tight quarters with little privacy, and lacking commonality as each member was trained in their one area. As the team NCOIC, you know it is important to address the issue. However, the team as a whole denies that a problem exists.

"Misplaced" Uniforms

During an inspection of some locked containers, you find one to have a number of uniforms, including some packages that have never been opened. You are aware that some of the host national Soldiers were in critical need of these uniforms. When you question COL X, the customs security battalion commander, about these supplies, COL X becomes very upset and requests to know who had opened the container for you. COL X explains that his supply officer was doing this to make the commander look bad, and that he needed to be punished.

Gender Issues

Your transition team has separated into several different functional elements. Your element consists of a female 1st LT, a male SGT, and your interpreter who assists you with building a relationship with the host nation LT S4. Your mission is to get the S4's shop working. One day, your 1st LT is leading conversation and asking how your element could help get them up to speed. After some conversation, the host nation LT tells your 1st LT to get him fuel and water. Your 1st LT explains that it isn't her mission to do these types of things for the host nationals, rather to illustrate how to do them correctly. Frustrated by this, the host nation LT said that if she wasn't going to get him fuel and water to get out of his office. She looks to you (the transition team element) for support.

Dishonesty with Host Nation Soldiers

You are a member of a 10 man border transition team, and you've received new mission tasking to advise a host nation Company in the Divalo River Valley. This company was being moved from its current COP in what it considered a safe area to set up a new COP in a town only recently cleared of al-Qaida. This host nation Company (100 Soldiers) is intended to maintain security after CF cleared the town. When your team showed up at the old COP, the CF CDR warned you that this host nation Company would refuse to go to this new town since they considered it too dangerous. He then said not to worry about it, and that he would tell them that they were going to a less dangerous location to get them to comply.

TAT2

Developing Shared Understanding and Trust in Transition Teams

The objective of this training guide is to help develop effective and agile Transition Teams, who are faced with multiple challenges including unfamiliar team members originating from different branches and MoSs. The STAT process is based on existing scenario-based training, tactical decision making games, best practices in the field, and contributions from Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Ft Huachuca, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Ft Riley, Ft Bragg, Army field personnel at Ft Leavenworth, Army fi

The development of this training guide is being conducted by Aptima and the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences Aberdeen Proving Ground and Ft. Leavenworth Research Units who also sponsor the effort. For more work conducted by the contributing organizations, please visit the following websites: http://www.aptima.comorganizations, please visit the following websites: http://www.aptima.com

The current STAT training guide should be considered a draft and is being employed for further validation research. It is not meant for reproduction and/or distribution unless approved by the contacts listed.

Kara L. Orvis, Ph.D. Aptima, Inc. korvis@aptima.com



Gregory A. Ruark, Ph.D. U.S. Army Research Institute gregory.a.ruark@us.army.mil Linda G. Pierce, Ph.D. U.S. Army Research Institute linda.pierce@us.army.mil

